SEMINARY EDUCATION AFTER VATICAN II

VOLUME 48

1967

REPORT OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

Held in Montreal, Canada
June 12-15, 1967

PUBLISHED BY
FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

EDITOR:
ERNEST F. LATKO, O.F.M.
Christ the King Seminary
West Chicago, Illinois 60185

LC
495
F7F7
v.48
GTU Storage

SEMINARY EDUCATION AFTER VATICAN II

VOLUME 48

1967

REPORT OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

Held in Montreal, Canada
June 12-15, 1967

PUBLISHED BY
FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

EDITOR:
ERNEST F. LATKO, O.F.M.
Christ the King Seminary
West Chicago, Illinois 60185

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION

LC
495
F7F7
v.48

CUM PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

COPYRIGHT 1969
Franciscan Educational Conference
Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

The Minor Seminary—Yes or No 1
Alban Carroll, S.A.

The Seminary Library 11
Vincent Dieckman, O.F.M.

The Seminary College Steps into the Future 24
Valentine Healy, O.F.M.

Seminarians on University Campus 35
Valentine M. Jankowski, O.F.M. Conv.

Development of the Person in Seminaries 47
Martin Pable, O.F.M. Cap.

Midwest Association of Theology Schools 61
Russan Cole, O.F.M. Conv.

Scripture in a Total Program 71
Otto Bucher, O.F.M. Cap.

Moral Theology after Vatican II 82
Matthew Herron, T.O.R.

320802

The Apostolic or Pastoral Formation of Future Franciscan Priests 102
Richard Bergeron, O.F.M.

Reorganization of the Theology Curriculum 112
Sabbas Kilian, O.F.M.

Appendix I 147

Appendix II 149

Index 150

OFFICERS OF
FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

President

Rev. Ralph Di Pasquale, O.F.M.

Vice-President

Rev. Augustine Patrick, O.F.M. Conv.

Secretary

Rev. Hermes Kreilkamp, O.F.M. Cap.

Treasurer

Rev. Irenaeus Herscher, O.F.M.

THE MINOR SEMINARY—YES OR NO

ALBAN CARROLL, S.A.

The question of the value of the minor seminary is a perennial one. Most of the time we manage to confine it to our subconscious but every so often it insists on surfacing. The end of the school year is most frequently the time when many question the value of minor seminary. I've been asked to give my own ideas about the minor seminary, so I will try to keep this paper on a personal level, without having much recourse to outside sources. After twelve years in the minor seminary I have some strong oponions about its value and some of these opinions predate Vatican II. So please bear with me, especially if you find yourself in disagreement.

When I speak of the minor seminary I would like to confine myself to the four years of high school in a minor seminary boarding school. That is what we have at Montour Falls, N.Y. and unless I'm mistaken most of us Franciscans have the same setup. Perhaps in some cases the first two years of college are also in the same building. We are all familiar with the statistics on minor seminaries and seminarians. Since World War II there has been a substantial increase in the number of minor seminaries. In 1946 there were 126. In 1966 we find 269. The number of minor seminarians has also increased from 14,599 in 1946 to 30,744 in 1966.[1] Many southern and western dioceses have built their own minor seminary during this period and the increase of the Order seminaries has kept pace.

Why do we have such an increase in the number of minor seminaries and seminarians during this period? One reason would be the general increase of the Catholic population. The number of priests and those training for the priesthood must try to match the Catholic population. This, of course, has not yet been attained because the Catholic population has increased 90% since 1946 and the number of priests has increased only 51%. The number of

seminarians, on the other hand, has grown 109% but this percentage includes minor seminarians. This vitiates an otherwise rosy picture when you realize that the perseverance rate among minor seminarians hovers around 10%.[2] Another strong reason for the increase of minor seminarians is the persisting idea that if a boy finishing grammar school has a desire in some way to be a priest, he should give it a try in the minor seminary as soon as possible, lest in some way it be lost by remaining outside. You can add your own reasons to these two and I'm sure that they would be of value too.

It would well be that some of you are the fruits of the minor seminary. You entered in the ninth grade; or according to the Quebec system you entered in Éléments. Others might have entered during high school. In either case your vocation to the priesthood was put to the test in the minor seminary and your presence here today testifies to the fact that the minor seminary has produced many fine priests. I cannot say for sure what the percentage is of those priests who entered in the ninth grade or during high school. I believe that it is a substantial one. If this is so, why do we consistantly find ourselves questioning the value of the minor seminary? It might be helpful if we tackle that question by giving some of the pros and cons for the minor seminary.

Just what are some of the advantages of the minor seminary boarding school from my point of view? In theory I say that we offer the boys the following:

1. A solid core of college preparatory studies.
2. Plenty of study time to prepare for classes.
3. The young man can be with other young men who share similar ambitions for the priesthood.
4. The student is given more opportunity to exercise his independence away from his family. He has to make a number of decisions on his own—e.g. the spending of his money, his use of free time, etc.
5. The minor seminarian is able to make a broader range of contacts with students from other states, provinces and backgrounds.
6. He participates in daily Mass, spiritual exercises. Spiritual directors are readily available as well as counselors.

7. In the seminary there is a well-rounded schedule of meals, sports and apostolic activities geared to the young man's capabilities.

8. All these boys can profit from their stay in the minor seminary even those who leave. Their faith is stronger and a number of them become fervent lay leaders. Other *pros* can be added silently by yourselves.

What practical result do we Franciscans receive from the minor seminary? It's this compelling truth. The minor seminary boarding school is still the main source for filling our novitiates and colleges. This is hard to gainsay and must be kept in account.

Now what are some of the *cons* in reference to the minor seminary? I will list what I think some of them are and then I would like to go into detail on a few points.

1. The boys are starting toward a distant goal too early in life.

2. The students are living in a one-sided world—the world of the male teen-ager, the priest and the brother. The former have little meaningful, prolonged contact with the outside world except during vacation time.

3. The seminarians are often pressured to adjust to class leaders or trends—leaders and trends which are often cleverly opposed to the rule and the purpose of the seminary.

4. Each year the students witness an attrition rate that often whittles a class in half or down to a third of its initial number by the time it is ready to graduate.

5. Students themselves are questioning more and more the value of the minor seminary.

6. The present unrest going on within the Church; the questioning of the priestly life, of celibacy, of permanent commitment, of outmoded customs, of change and adaptation or the lack of it often leave many of the seminarians confused at a time when the very fact of being on adolescent can be confusing enough.

7. The various Franciscan groups are spending vast sums of money to keep minor seminaries opened. And not only money. How many priests, brothers and laymen are expending their time and talents for the small trickle of students who survive to ordination!

8. Students lack the freedom to be adolescents without final

judgments having to be passed on them at some point along the line in the minor seminary as to whether they should stay with us or not.

We could continue adding more of the disadvantages of the minor seminary boarding school. But time forbids. Let us just linger upon some aspects of an adolescent and the minor seminary. Adolescence, as we know, is a search for identity. Young men are beginning to look for a meaning to their lives. They are starting to awaken to a whole new horizon of ideas and values. Whether it be a question of dating, love, marriage, children; whether it be the attainment of one of the many possible professions opening before them—all of these offer distinct possibilities to the young man in the seminary as he advances from first high school to third and fourth. The image of the priesthood, which drew him to the seminary in the first place and which in many ways is embellished while he remains in it, has to compete with the attraction of numerous other possible ways of life. Not having made a mature, well thought out choice before he entered—being only thirteen or fourteen years of age—the seminarian's desire to be a priest often vanishes when it has to compete with other goals. This should be no surprise to us, for what boy of thirteen or fourteen, or fifteen or sixteen for that matter, has anything but the vaguest idea of what he would really like to be for the rest of his life. The practice of beginning to prepare so early toward a professional goal in life—and that is what the priesthood is—has no duplicate in any other profession. Do doctors, lawyers, engineers etc. begin training possible candidates at such an early age? I do not think so. The North American system of professional training begins much later. It is only when a person has entered college or even after he finishes college that he begins to train for a particular profession. How often people smile upon us benignly when we say that we teach in the minor seminary and start preparing young boys in their early teens for the priesthood! It does so seem like the vestige of another civilization. Even many Catholics, lay and clerical, give you a quizzical look when you mention the age brackets of the students. In their silent way these Catholics seem to be saying "Oh! you're kidding Father!" Unfortunately I'm not kidding. We have brought over to America

a European practice and we have been trying for a century to make it go native. I don't think that we have been as successful as all our efforts would warrant.

I believe strongly that an adolescent has to be offered frequent occasions to be free, to be indecisive, to make about faces, or perhaps to do just nothing. Our adolescents are already bound to a heavy school schedule. Yet the type of freedom that our adolescents need is impossible in an institution like the minor seminary. Institutional living puts the adolescent into a situation which he often unconsciously revolts against. The institution has its horarium which begins in the morning and doesn't simply stop at 3 P.M. It continues until 10 or 11 P.M. It varies of course but it still remains an horarium and all the inmates in some way have to bow to it. The institution has its goals. It is always pointing out to them in sermons, private talks, disciplinary meetings. Thse fixed goals often seem so unreal and distant (ten to thirteen years distant, in fact) to the young seminarian. He can't live in the future. The present is often a difficult challenge for him. The institution has its watchfulness and rightly so. The institution must do its weeding. The institution is often overly possessive. It is frequently too confining to a student on his off hours. Doesn't the average adolescent want to assert himself, to revolt occasionally, to get away by himself, to mix with other people, to do other things, not to do anything at all, to dream other dreams. The total institution, and that is what the minor seminary boarding school is, is not capable of permitting that in my opinion, dispite all the updating and adaptation that is employed.

Some of the reasons given in the past for the minor seminar sound rather weak today. In times past the minor seminary was one of the few ways for a boy to get a classical education in preparation for the major seminary. But this is no longer true today. Most Catholic and public high schools offer as good if not a better classical education.

Often the argument is heard that as soon as an adolescent indicates a desire to be a priest and has finished grammar school he should leave the 'world' with all its preoccupations with money, sex, pleasure etc. If this is not done the implication is that a

possible vocation will be lost. This sounds convincing at first, but on closer examination it's nothing but the old panic button being pushed—this time for a 'spiritual' reason. What is this 'world' that must be avoided? It's the world in which our parents and kinfolk, our pastors, curates and nuns, our friends and acquaintances must live and work out their salvation. It's a world that has been sanctified by Christ's physical presence in time and His sacramental presence today. We do not live in a Manichean world. This world is moving along the road to redemption. Christ has sanctified it or do we really believe it? Has a plague descended upon the world leaving only little enclaves free of the touch of its hand? (In this case the minor seminary.) We sometimes seem to reason as if it has. If a possible vocation given to an eight grader cannot survive the give-and-take of family living, an outside high school education, the reasonable mixing of the sexes, the mental, emotional and physical growth of adolescence, the grace of the sacraments, prayer, and conscious choice of good Catholic companions, then truly God is simply playing with us and reneging on His Holy Spirit. Let us not underestimate the power of God.

When we say that a possible vocation can be helped and strengthened by being answered as soon as possible, we are presuming a great deal on the part of the minor seminary to do just that. But aren't we marking ourselves too high? It's my firm conviction that many possible vocations are lost in the minor seminary. The vast majority of the minor seminarians come with a great deal of good will. But sad to relate each year a varying number of them lose their good will. Some of this is due naturally to the fact that like most adolescents they have changed their minds and want to try something else. On the other hand some of this is due to reasons peculiar to the minor seminary boarding school. For example, the lack, more and more, of a consistent form of discipline which all the faculty and brothers in the school will enforce consistently. In these days of experimentation discipline seems to be up for grabs. Furthermore some profs seem unable to prevent themselves from getting to involved in the students' lives. In addition there is the danger of friction between a faculty member and some students or between the administration and

some students. Despite who is right or wrong in the matter this has an unsettling effect upon all the students. Each year amongst the students themselves there are some who undermine in a myriad of ways the very purpose of the seminary. These students are extremely skillful in cloaking their activities for long periods of time. Meanwhile they lead other seminarians away from the goal that brought them here in the first place. Lastly there is the presence of the oversell of the priesthood in the minor seminary. It's difficult to avoid it. In sermons, private talks, group discussions, confessional exhortation we find the repeated mention of the priesthood. After a while this overall is handled deftly by the boys. Many of them just 'tune us off'. Religion and the priestly goal are good in themselves but they can and are being overdone. In adolescence there is often a revolt against the compulsiveness of religion. And students in the minor seminary are just adolescents who in their own individual way revolt against the compulsiveness of the indoctrination. Just look at their faces after the novelty of religious exercises has worn off. It doesn't matter whether it be a concelebration, a folk Mass, public prayer, benediction or compline. The religious training, relaxed as it is becoming, still does not give the minor seminarian the chance to 'opt' out, with the result that he simply endures it in many cases.

Is all the above a bleak picture? Maybe. But let me not leave you with the impression that the minor seminary is a bleak place. Far from it. The school year is a busy one—with classes, trips, sports, contests, visits, ecumenical activities. Time goes by quickly. The boys grow, become more assured, offer great promise in a number of instances. But each year of those who survive and finish the four years, some graduates and then leave, others go to the novitiate and then leave, others advance to college and then leave, still others move ahead into theology and then leave. When ordination day comes along, only one or two or three at the most of those who began in first year high school are still around to have the bishop impose his hands upon them. And again and again the idea comes back to me that the reason there are so few at ordination is that they began too early. They came long before they could make any mature judgment between the life outside and the life inside. They had little first-hand knowledge of how

things really are outside. They knew nothing of the struggle to get a college education, of a hitch in the armed services, of the drudgery of the many jobs that people are forced by circumstances to stick with. So frequently you hear them say that they are missing out on the school of hard knocks. When I look at the class pictures in our seminary hallway I find it a sobering experience. So many faces that have disappeared! I thing the class pictures are trying to tell us something. They are trying to teach us a lesson. "Many are called but few are chosen" can easily be changed to "many come young, but mighty few survive."

Why are we so reluctant to let the minor seminary go? Why do we insist on keeping this European transplant alive in an environmetn that has been so hostile to it? Why do we allow the sick body to keep on struggling by granting more freedom within the minor seminary, by modernizing the course of studies, by making available more outside contacts, by introducing mixed faculties, when we see that even these do not stop the yearly dropout? If the American Church is finally beginning to recognize the innate value of certain broad American customs on the religious level—i.e. separation of Church and State, religious freedom for all, cooperation amongst various religious bodies in the field of social action, why are we so reluctant to accept a firm American practice on the educational level? This firm American practice is to allow and encourage its young high school people to be just what they are—i.e. adolescents, groping, changing, wanting to be this today and that tomorrow, investigating the wide sweep of future commitments and remaining free not to choose any until they at least have high school behind them. Teenage marriages do poorly on the marital level. Teenage vocations which leave the North American scene in high school years do even more poorly on the ecclesiastical level.

One of the reasons why we are so reluctant to part with the minor seminary is that we are in so deep financially. At great expense through the years—in building construction, faculty training, regional accreditation etc. we have raised the physical and educational levels of many of our minor seminaries. This being the case with many of us Franciscans, is there any way out? I think so. The move should be a gradual but determined one. We

must first free ourselves from the minor seminary hypnosis. We must be willing to gradually relinquish this frame of reference of a former age and focus our main thrust toward a maturer, more stable audience. Instead of increasing the minor seminary enrollment and facilities, let us earnestly start diverting funds and personnel toward activities that bring us Franciscans into meaningful contacts with high school graduates, college students, young workers. Whether it be parish groups for young unmarrieds, Newman clubs, the armed services, our numerous Catholic high schools and colleges or what have you, Christ can penetrate any of these with a call to the religious life and the priesthood. If the religious life and the priesthood have any relevancy today—and we sincerely believe that they do—then God will attract maturer candidates to further them. We believe that, but we often act as if God only speaks His words of invitation to eighth graders. We throw up our hands and say that even in our Catholic high schools and colleges there are few if any vocations. If this were the real truth, then we Franciscans would be asking ourselves if we had not become irrelevant to the twentieth century. If even from our own institutions—our parishes, our schools or many contacts—we were not able to draw sufficient vocations to secure our future growth then we would be moving toward obsolescence.

However, I am of the strong opinion that God is calling many today. They are often just waiting to be approached by the right person or group that has a real challenge to offer. Let's not sell short our Catholic laity. They are aware of the need of more vocations today. Catholics as a whole still look up to their priests, brothers and nuns. We Catholics do not suffer from any great historical stigma here in North America. In such a favorable milieu vocations should be more plentiful that we are willing to admit. But we have to adopt new ways of recruiting them without seeking refuge in the minor seminary syndrome. The entrance numbers would be smaller but the survivors would be greater in number and not the products of thirteen years of institutionalism. Until we are convinced of this and are more willing to direct our greatest effort toward a more adult audience, we will continue to fall back upon the minor seminary as a tranquilizer. Let us Franciscans be willing to grant adolescent high schoolers their freedom.

NOTES

[*Editor's Note*: References to Vatican Documents are to: Walter M. Abbott, (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II.* New York: Guild Press, 1966. Cited throughout this volume as: *Documents.*]

[1] Cf. *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin,* Feb. 1967, p. 24.
[2] Cf. *America,* June 3, 1967, p. 800.

THE SEMINARY LIBRARY

VINCENT DIECKMAN, O.F.M.

The late President John F. Kennedy once made the observation that the library is no longer the handmaiden of education, but is as important to education as classroom instruction and complements it. As the chapel is the spiritual heart of the seminary, so the library is its intellectual heart.

In recent years libraries have been constructed near the very center of school activity. For example, the new, magnificent 14-story library at Notre Dame University now dominates the campus scene as a symbol of the university's drive for academic excellence. The new McDonald Memorial Library at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio, which was dedicated May 7, 1967, is situated close to the center of the institution. So too the library in a seminary should enjoy a prominent position as an external sign of its importance.

Twenty years ago this Conference devoted its entire attention to the Franciscan library. The Report contained in volume 28 consists of 462 pages.[1] Father James Kortendick, S.S., who heads the Department of Library Science at the Catholic University of America, comments on this Report, "This issue of the Francican Educational Conference proceedings has not been referred to in subsequent literature as much as it deserves.[2]

Spirit of Vatican II

Since 1947 much has happened including of course the Second Vatican Council. Certain developments within the Church at large and also within the Franciscan families' educational institutions are reflected in the library. If there is no such reflection something is wrong. Librarians cannot afford to assume the attitude of business as usual. What a recent article in *The Priest* titled "Vatican II and Seminary Reform," stresses can well be applied to the library. The writer says:

> There is a grave danger that the *Decree on Priestly Formation* will be seen as 'more of the same' and therefore met with the attitude 'we have been doing these things all along anyway.' This can be avoided if the document is seen within the context from which it comes (the spirit of renewal which permeates all the decrees and constitutions of Vatican II) and if it is implemented with the same spirit.[3]

Librarians can do this implementing by making the collection of printed matter meet the fresh challenges which are cropping up with every passing month.

While looking forward, the librarian cannot escape the duty of also looking backward because the book and periodical collections hold the long story of the past, the annals of tradition. One cannot gauge the future without knowing what has happened in the past. Hence, while the librarian should be liberal in outlook he must not refuse to be also conservative. Another way of saying this is: Not only worthwhile books published during and since Vatican II, but also their counterparts of yesteryear have place in the library.

Pastoral Orientation

In this paper the theological seminary library is considered, but nevertheless much of the following alo applies to the library in the house of philosophy and the minor seminary. *The Decree on Priestly Formation* says, "Major seminaries are necessary for prietly formation."[4] The editor of *The Documents of Vatican II* makes the pertinent remark that the recognition of the need for major seminaries needed restatement. It goes without staying that if the major seminary is necessary, the library is also essential. The decree referred to above states that the purpose of a seminary is "to provide for the development of true shepherds of souls after the model of our Lord Jesus Christ."[5] Since according to the Council the whole program of seminary instruction is pastoral in purpose, the library must reflect this pastoral outlook. In reference to the pastoral orientation of the entire seminary program, Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban, South Africa said, "The principal preoccupation of the seminary should be to mold its pupils into competent communicators of the Faith. Its chief object is not to

promote academic knowledge but to impart communicable knowledge."[6]

It seems appropriate at this point to quote, in part, the response to the *Decree on Priestly Formation.* This response was prepared by a Council observer, Warren A. Quanbeck, professor of systematic theology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota. He writes:

> There are two points where one wishes that the Decree spoke more fully. Virtually nothing is said about a most important tool of theological education, the library. If the Council's impulse for the renewal of the Church is to be realized, students must certainly have access not only to their own heritage but also to the theological interpretations of other traditions and even to the questions raised by earnest men who belong to no Church . . . A second topic calling for fuller treatment is the faculty.[7]

Library Objectives

The most recently published book on the theological seminary library, *The Library in the Catholic Theological Seminary in the United States,* was written by Father James Kortendick, S.S., a veteran librarian mentioned previously. This excellent nationwide study covers almost every phase of the seminary library and is filled with provoking statistics. From it much of the material in this paper is drawn.[8] Since the major seminary is an institution of higher learning, its library has first of all the general objectives of the library of any institution of higher learning. The objectives of the seminary library are based on the aims of the seminary itself. The goal of seminary education is to coordinate with the intellectual program of training, a program of moral, spiritual and professional training aimed at the development of priestly character and proficiency in the pastoral ministry.

The special objevtives of the seminary library include the following: To provide a balanced and well selected collection of spiritual reading material to help the students in their spiritual training for the priesthood; to provide appropriate library materials which will assist the students in preparing for their professional duties as shepherds of souls; to stimulate an interest in the seminarians for continual study after ordination; in Franciscan

seminaries, to develop the collection of Franciscan publications; to provide material and reference service to others not connected with the seminary, especially to priests in the area to assist them in their pastoral duties. Elements essential for carrying out these objectives are: Conviction of the importance of the library on the part of the administration; a trained librarian aided with sufficient staff assistance; adequate financial support to build a well balanced collection; cooperation of the faculty and enough space for expansion.

Library Control

The library should be under the direction of a full-time librarian who possesses a degree in library science. He should have full responsibility for the library with the advice of a library committee and the seminary administration. The library director should be a priest or brother of such quality and training as to enjoy faculty status. It is up to the librarian, by keeping himself alert to theological currents, to create a spirit conductive to independent study on part of the seminarians. Moreover, there must be between librarian and teacher a fellow feeling that will induce the latter to have his students make more extensive use of the library rsources. Likewise, if librarians are to take part in the Church's renewal, they "must seek fellowship with all librarians of whatever social condition or ecclesial connection."[9]

The library committee composed of the librarian and representatives of the faculty and administration serves in an advisory capacity. Concerned with the overall policy of the seminary such a committee can be helpful interpreter of the needs of faculty and students. The budget for the library should be a definite amount of money sufficient to provide all necessary services. At the Catholic Library Association convention held last March in Cleveland, it was the opinion of most seminary librarians that 7% to 9% of total seminary expenditures should be allocated for the library. Dependent on the size of the faculty and number of students, there should be an adequate number of library assistants properly trained for their respective tasks. In a large library salaried clerical help is necessary.

The Collections

A library cannot function well unles there is a book collection broad in depth and scope and sufficient in size to satisfy the minds of its clientele. Frequently the failure of a seminary is not in its administrative makeup but its inability to give quality education, because it does not support its program with a collection of books and service that meets the needs of the curriculum.[10] Acquisition of books and periodicals should reflect current developments in the various fields of theology and related sciences. However, as more and more newly published titles are acquired, older important works must be considered too. In selecting books the librarian must keep his eyes open, for example, not only for Teilhard de Chardin, Karl Rahner and the like, but also for other authors who are more conservative in outlook. The size of the collection should be such that the objectives of the seminary are attained. In keeping with the guidelines set forth in the *Decree on Priestly Formation*, the collection should include materials which will help the students, in the words of the Decree, "to search for solutions to human problems with the light of revelation to apply eternal truths to the changing conditions of human affairs, and to communicate such truths in a manner suited to contemporary man."[11]

The *Decree on Priestly Formation* outlines the traditional theological disciplines, namely, Sacred Scripture, dogmatic, moral and pastoral theology, canon law, church history and liturgy. In addition, the document stresses certain other fields of study about which, till recently, there were very few books in the majority of seminary libraries. These subjects include Protestant theology, world religions, the ecumenical movement, contemporary philosophy and science. As an example, the library of St. Leonard College, Dayton, Ohio, until the Council was convened, had only five books on ecumenism; now it has fifty. Librarians therefore have to devote more time and attention to books in these categories so that seminarians can "be led to a more adequate understanding of the churches and ecclesial communities separated from the Roman, Apostolic See."[12]

Books of this type read in relation to classroom texts, can help the students "better understand the elements of goodness and truth which such religions possess by God's Province."[13] The

Decree also notes that "students should be conversant with contemporary philosophical investigations, especially those exercising special influence in their own country, and with recent scientific progress."[14] In response of this requirement the librarian has to be very selective in view of the constantly growing flood of books about philosophy and science. Assisted with recommendations by the faculty, he should obtain in these two areas only books that are conducive to a deepr understanding of theology. The same is true in the selection of the theological books written by non-Catholic authors.

Choice of books is vitally important. Monsignor Arthur Riley, formerly librarian of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts, once wrote about books in general, "Proper selection of books is basic, for no matter how large or how elaborately cataloged may be a poorly selected collection, it will not be a library."[15] If this is true for books in general, it is all the more so with regard to the selection of non-Catholic religious and theological works.

Reference Section and Periodicals

The seminary library should have a reference collection distinct from the general circulating collection. The reference books should include the basic tools of theological research and study. Like the general collection, so too the reference section should be kept up to date. Among the most recently published reference works is the *New Catholic Encyclopedia.*[16] This indispensable reference set which incorporates the viewpoint of Vatican II surely should be in every seminary library despite the price. Included among the 4900 contributors is a comparatively large number of specialists from the various Franciscan families. If a seminary can afford to buy only one encyclopedia the NCE is the set to buy.[17]

The library should also have a well selected collection of theological journals including the most significant current titles as well as easily accessible back files of such periodicals as are pertinent to theological study and research. In libraries where the problems of insufficient space arises, obsolete and unnecessary serials should be weeded out. When the elimination of older periodicals becomes a necessity, the librarian and faculty should cooperate in deciding which journals are to go.

Index of Forbidden Books

In June, 1966, the index of forbidden books was scrapped. In view of the spirit of Vatican II, this development did not come as a surprise. The suppression of the index creates problems for the librarian. The question arises: What to do with the books which for years were kept under lock and key? One solution is suggested. Such books may continue to rest at ease in the library inferno until a faculty member requests that certain titles, relating to his subject matter be put into general circulation. To provide for similar requests on part of the students, a practical procedure may be worked out at a meeting between the librarian and the whole faculty. Related to the index is the *imprimatur*. It need only be mentioned here that in October, 1966, the Canon Law Society of America, in discussing the forthcoming revision of the Code of Canon Law, recommended the abolition of the *imprimatur*.[18]

Interlibrary Loan and Extension Service

No matter how well stocked a library may be, it will not have every book or periodical requested. The librarian can solve this problem rather easily by means of interlibrary loan service for both faculty and students. Most libraries are willing to send material upon request, subject of course to standardized regulations. Since interlibrary loans work both ways, seminary librarians should cooperate with other institutions, especially with neighboring seminary, public and college libraries. A practical means of facilitating interlibrary loans is compiling up-to-date holdings of periodicals and sending such lists to other seminaries.

The library should also be open to priests, lay people and students from other schools who wish to use its resources. To furnish such extension service, the Franciscan library must of course be outside the cloister limits. Service of this kind, especially for priests, is clearly indicated in the *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* where it recommends the setting up of libraries for the use of priests in pastoral studies.[19]

Catholic Microfilm Center

In connection with interlibrary loan and extension service, an interesting experiment may be mentioned. Since the start of the Council, a forward-looking, non-profit organization called the Catholic Microfilm Center has begun in Alma College, Los Gatos, California.[20] Its purpose is to facilitate the sharing of Catholic library resources with all libraries. Through the Center the world's greatest cumulation of library resources will be accessible to any library or scholar. Among its projects are the microfilming of 5000 volumes in Europe of materials not generally available in America and the accumulation of a complete library of Catholic religious periodicals. At a relatively low cost the Center offers specific services. Thus, if one needs the text of an article in *Biblica,* the Center will supply it at 10¢ per page.

A word about the automation of libraries may be in place at this point.[21] Literature on libraries of the future is increasing but at present such libraries are in the theoretical stage.[22] The writer does not know of any major seminary library that has introduced mechanized library services. Since Franciscan libraries cannot afford to purchase computers at present, nor will they be able to do so for a long time to come, detailed treatment of this intriguing subject is left to some future friar librarian.

Franciscan Libraries

Most of what has been said so far holds for any major seminary library. What about Franciscan libraries in the post-Vatican II era? In preparation for the revision of the General Constitutions of the Order of Friars Minor, a list of ideas was published by the Central Commission on O.F.M. Renewal. It bears the title *On the Appropriate Renewal—Order of Friars Minor.*[23] In this schema which contains 575 articles, the library is not mentioned once. To fill this vacuum, Father Jovian Lang, O.F.M., who is now president of the Catholic Library Association, canvassed the opinion several provincial librarians in the United States and subsequently drew up a compilation of ideas about Franciscan libraries. These suggestions were given to a member of the Central Commission, Father Alan McCoy, O.F.M., who

since then has been elected provincial of Santa Barbara province.

The principal recommendations are these:

1. The superior should provide adequately for the reading needs of the friars especially when suitable books are not available from other libraries. Smaller friaries should be furnished with sufficient reference books. Each larger house should have a library located in a place fitted for he preservation of books and conducive to study.

2. In these larger houses librarians shall be appointed who are trained in librarianship according to up-to-date methods. In houses of study and in schools operated by the friars the librarian must have professional training in his field comparable to other members of the faculty. The brothers also should be encouraged to take up library science. Attendance at meetings of profssional librarians should be encouraged so that they might develop and broaden their knowledge and skill. Librarians should ipso facto enjoy faculty status with voting and other privileges. If necessary, even in houses of study, where no friar is available with the necessary training, laymen might be employed as librarians.

3. Specific funds should be allotted in each house for reading material.

4. Ordinarily, one library is designated as the provincial library. In addition to managing this library, the provincial librarian, having sufficient freedom to function effectively, shall have authority over all libraries in the province. His authority shall extend especially to the formation of a provincial union catalog, the preservation of material valuable for the history of the province, and the disposition of library materials to the best advantage of the whole province.

5. The provincial librarian should be free to inspect the libraries of the province; he shall report annually to the minister provincial concerning the condition of the libraries. He should be consulted whenever a new library is to be built, either as a separate unit or as part of another building.

6. It is also the duty of the provincial librarian to send to the library of the *Pontifical Athenaeum Antonianum* a copy of all works that have been written and published by the friars of his province, and as much as possible, a copy of books on Franciscan

subjects which have been written and published by other authors in the territory of his province.

7. The disposal and exchange of books will be done ordinarily by the librarians in cooperation with the provincial librarian. Rare books and incunabula should not be disposed of without expressly consulting the provincial librarian who is responsible to the provincial in this regard. Franciscan historical material including pamphlets should always be preserved.

It is the fond hope of Franciscan librarians that most of these ideas will be incorporated into the new edition of the general constitutions.

Special Franciscan Projects

The Franciscan Union Catalog which is housed in the library of St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N.Y., is a cooperative project. By means of this Catalog one can find out quickly where virtually any Franciscan book is located. To serve its purpose catalogers in the libraries of all the Franciscan families should send a card to the Union Catalog for every book written by a Franciscan or about a Franciscan subject. Unfortunately, there are some Franciscan catalogers who are not cooperating in this important undertaking.

This year a committee of the library section, Franciscan Educational Conference, published a book titled *Franciscan Subject Headings* in mimeograph form.[24] This work which took more than two years to compile includes also a list of all known Franciscan Sister communities and a list of Franciscan saints and blessed. This book is a must for every Franciscan library.

A new inter-community theological seminary experiment is under way in Chicago. Participating in this venture which is slated to start in September, 1968, are the Franciscan Province of the Sacred Heart, the Passionist Province of the Holy Cross and the Servites. The number of students will be about 120, the faculty about 16. What about the library in this new type seminary? In the meeting of the seminary planning committee held at St. Peter's friary, Chicago, February 4-5, 1967, the library received not a little attention.

Several items of information pertaining to the library are of

interest. Arrangements will be made for communal instruction and library facilities. Students will not attend classes at the University of Chicago but will be able to use its extensive library. The clerics of St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Illinois, who strongly favor the move, said their library can be organized, packed, transported and unpacked in one month's time. If there is sufficient space for large sections of the theological libraries of the participating communities, each group will bring to Chicago what it believes it needs. The suggestion was made that the three libraries should not be pooled since the inter-community seminary is to be an experiment. The foregoing items were taken from the constitutive plan of the committee. Beside other religious orders, the Franciscans will be closely watching this project during the next few years to see how it works out.

Conclusion

Forty years ago the first president of the Catholic Library Association, Father Albert O'Brien, O.F.M., had this to say about the seminary library, "Our libraries have remained at a standstill, rather they have consistently deterioriated, simply because we thought anybody could be a librarian."[25] In the book, *Seminary Education in a Time of Change,* published two years ago, Professor James M. Lee expressed his opinion on the same subject as follows:

> Despite papal pronouncements, and despite the long and rich tradition of the excellence of European seminary libraries (particularly monastic libraries) the state of libraries in American seminaries is quite wretched. While Catholic and secular universities often assert that the library is the heart of the institution, American seminaries can verily declare that their heart is the athletic field . . . One can legitimately wonder if conditions have changed much since Father O'Brien's address.[26]

This sharp criticism is pretty well confirmed in Father Kortendick's survey referred to in the first part of this paper.[27]

The present condition of Franciscan libraries, like so many other seminary libraries, leaves much to be desired. Under the impetus of Vatican II, Franciscan librarians have reason to hope for better

things to come. Their hopes will be more fully realized when superiors give more attention to planning ahead for the selection of young priests and brothers for librarianship and in choosing those who have shown interest, ability and fitness for the post of seminary librarian.

In conjunction with filling this primary need, the following recommendations should be seriously considered: That the library be allowed to operate on a budget which is planned by the librarian and based upon estimated needs for the year as determined by a long range plan of development; that the librarian be free from other assignments and also be given the opportunity to take part in professional library association activities; that efforts be made by seminary authorities to coordinate the library with the total spiritual and intellectual program of the seminary; that through faculty and librarian cooperation the seminarians become better acquainted with the greate literary treasures of the Catholic faith; that library service be extended to priests, scholars and other people who are interested in using the library; and finally that in fact as well as in theory the library become second only to the chapel as the most important part of the seminary.[28]

NOTES

[1] "Librarianship and the Franciscan Library," *Report of the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference,* v. 28 (December, 1947).

[2] James J. Kortendick, *The Library in the Catholic Theological Seminary in the United States* (Washngton, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965), p. 17.

[3] James A. O'Donohoe, "Vatican II and Seminary Reform," *The Priest,* v. 23 (April, 1967), p. 288.

[4] *Documents,* p. 442.

[5] *Documents, ibid.*

[6] O'Donohoe, *op. cit.,* p. 283.

[7] *Documents,* p. 460.

[8] In addition to the forementioned book, another source for this paper is "The Major Seminary Library Standards," a 4-page mimeographed outline proposed to the convention of the Catholic Library Association, Major Seminary Section, March 29, 1967, Cleveland, Ohio.

[9] Jovian Lang, "Involvement Today—For Tomorrow," inaugural address as president delivered before the convention of the Catholic Library Association, March 30, 1967, Cleveland, Ohio.

[10]Alphonse F. Trezza, "Like God, CLA Is Dead," *Catholic Library World,* v. 38 (April, 1967), p. 511.

[11] *Documents,* p. 452.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 453.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 450.

[15] Arthur J. Riley, "The Major Seminary Library," *Catholic Library Practice,* ed. David Martin (Portland, Oregon: University of Portland, 1947), v. 1, p. 53.

[16] *New Catholic Encyclopedia,* ed. William J. McDonald (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 15 vols.

[17] Harry C. Koenig, Book Review, *Catholic Library World,* v. 38 (May-June, 1967), p. 608.

[18] "Abolish the Imprimatur?" *Catholic Book Merchandiser,* v. 10, no. 1 (January-February, 1967), pp. 9-10.

[19] *Documents,* p. 571.

[20] The present address is: Catholic Microfilm Center, Alma Colllege Library, P.O. Box 1258, Los Gatos, California 95030.

[21] *The Brasenose Conference on the Automation of Libraries,* ed. John Harrison and Peter Laslett (London: Mansell Information/Publishing Limited, 1967).

[22] J. C. Licklider, *Libraries of the Future* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1965).

[23] Central Commission on O.F.M. Renewal, *On the Appropriate Renewal—Order of Friars Minor.* Schema II, translated by Valentine Young, (Chicago, Illinois: Franciscan Herald Press, 1967).

[24] *Franciscan Subject Headings,* compiled by a Committee of the Library Section, Franciscan Educational Conference. (Lake Geneva, Wsconsin: Provincial Depository Library, 1967).

[25] Albert O'Brien, "The Seminary Library," *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin,* v. 23 (November, 1926), p. 563.

[26] *Seminary Education in a Time of Change,* ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1965), p.. 113-114.

[27] Kortendick, *op. cit.,* pp. 282-292.

[28] *Ibid.,* pp. 292-295.

THE SEMINARY COLLEGE STEPS INTO THE FUTURE

VALENTINE HEALY, O.F.M.

It's the prerogative of a speaker to change the title of his presentation. I choose to do so because I feel the substitute title —*"What to Do Until the Doctor Arrives"*—is more appropriate to what I have to say. I hope, too, that the substitute titles echoes a Broadway comedy and carries with it a note of humor because humor is not out of place in a time of stress when we are minded to take ourselves and our work so very seriously. We make ourselves so very important! What's needed, I'm convinced, is a touch of the proportion that is humor. Laughing at one self is stimulating and encouraging; it can freshen imagination and bring forth creativity.

"What to do until the doctor arrives" also hints at an emergency and, in a real way, considerable amounts of data indicate a kind of crisis. Vatican II has issued urgent challenges; empirical studies of ordained priests' attitudes and personal experience of seminarian-unrest forbid passivity; the world-wide human condition in 1967 appeals for the saving ministry of Christ's priestliness.

Acknowledging these pressures and taking their measure ought not lead us to paralysis. It would be tragic if we allowed ourselves to be so stunned and overwhelmed, we simply panic and do nothing. Or become latter-day "prophets of gloom." Or unreflective activists.

I'll have something to say about "what to do" but what I have to offer will not at all conform to "ideal" measures. "The doctor" in my substitute title—the one we are tempted to look for at conventions and elsewhere—is the fellow with all the answers. He is the fount of security because he "knows." He can come up with the perfect answer to each and every problem research presents. He can do more; he can prevent the recurrence of problems or their transmutation into new ones. I don't disguise my-

self as such a doctor. Because I have a nagging suspicion that the assumption he exists or will arrive is simply a disguised way of repeating the errors of past seminary education. That is, looking for a condition or a structure or the absence-of-structure of such a kind that we administrators and teachers need not bother about any future change. Get things changed, and then relax—this is the temptation in present renewal suggestions, as I suspect it was in large measure responsible for the very conditions of today which demand change. In any case, I'm not the doctor.

If I'm not the "doctor" with permanent remedies; not the one who has pushed the panic button; not the one who's been (or at least wants to be) paralyzed into inactivity; then, who am I and what do I pretend to offer?

I look upon myself and this first formal presentation of the 1967 Franciscan Educational Conference as "first aid." I come not to give the final and definitive diagnosis and treatment; I don't know that much; does anybody? But I believe I can help prepare the patient for such treatment by another at another time when the diagnosis may be made more slowly, carefully, and with much more experimental data than is now available. The "first aid" I propose is intended to do two important things:

(1) to keep the patient alive by removing from seminaries some of their most evident shortcomings;

(2) to do some learning about the patient before he gets to the emergency receiving room.

A "first aid man" can do certain things "before the doctor arrives" because he has an idea of what "health" is. The directives of Vatican II in its decree on the priestly ministry, on the modern world, and in other documents, describe the desired health. Let me list some of the evidences as I see these apply to the seminary-college.

(1) The seminarian is acquanited thoroughly and personally with the thought of his own country and with the currents of concern among the literate and influential as well as among the masses. At the same time he is familiar also with "perennial philosophy"—which is not Thomism as such, as some authorities used to insist Canon Law and *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* and

other papal documents meant, but seems rather to be the enduring insights in scholastic philosophy.[1]

(2) The seminarian knows not only philosophy but its nexus with theology and the theological disciplines he will soon study. The two sciences are recognized as different but related. The seminarian is to be true to each and to the relationship between them.

(3) While not necessarily a "philosophy major" in his undergraduate program, the seminarian is to be competent in logic, epistemology, methodology, metaphysics. Competency not course credits is what the United States Bishops' Committee on Seminaries insists on. Ends, not means, are emphasized—and this can be important is our renewal efforts.

(4) Vatican II demands throughout the seminary college experience a pastoral orientation. I'd footnote this demand by reminding that "pastoral" and "parochial" are not coextensive terms. I feel very strongly that we must break an unwitting identification of the two. The parish is only one among many ways of fulfilling Christ's redemptive work.

(5) Another demand is that all learning be biblically and liturgically centered. Source and expression are to have place along with systematization; all three, not merely the last-named.

(6) The educational process in the sminary is to be a cooperative process involving administrators, teachers, and seminarians, and perhaps the entire community of the People of God. Responsibility is shared by all these segments, and this is a reminder we ought not forget.

(7) There are many other directives and descriptive phrases that could be cited. Let me conclude with a multi-purpose word: seminaries must be flexible. Reform and renewal are ongoing—isn't this why the U.S. Conference of Bishops decided to make its Committee on Seminaries a permanent committee? Yet the mood and temptation as I read conversations with rectors and faculties, and books and articles are to chase subconsciously the possibility of a "perfect" and indestructible seminary arrangement. Utopianism of this sort is confining, it binds up the imagination, it easily prefers a distant (and perhaps unattainable) perfection to a present good or improvement. And a closed and stifled mentality is the last thing Vatican II wants in seminaries. Desired and

demanded are an openness to change and a buoyantly confident risk-taking founded on good sense.

Now that I've revealed my own philosophy and listed some of the salient directives of Vatican II, I'd like to suggest how we can get healthy right here and now. Most if not all of my suggestions could be put into effect in a year's time.

(1) Laymen and lay women on our faculties. Competency in academics, a general moral rectitude, and sympathy with the seminary's ideals are the only qualifications I'd set. In recommending non-clerics, I am not subscribing to the idea that for priests to teach in a school situation is un-ecclesial or un-sacerdotal. I am suggesting that positive benefits come to seminary faculty and students from professional contact with non-clerical minds and personalities. I know financing employment of non-clerics can be a financial burden; I know also firsthand the dedication and generosity of the Catholic and non-Catholic laity; there are qualified retired teachers, military, and others who would be positively thrilled if asked to assist in the formation of future priests. Need I draw attention to the opening that employment of non-clerics can aid rectors in weeding their faculties of cleric-teachers who come up short in competency, zeal, etc. When you don't have to ask a personnel-short provincial for a cleric-replacement, you'd be surprised how ready the provincial is to satisfy your legitimate requests. Further, you can see the opportunities that open for Franciscan brothers to teach in seminaries and for Franciscan priest-teachers to do some of the specializing in subject content that they've been trained to do. And exchange of professors with other institutions, seminary and otherwise; and sabbaticals; and research; and on and on.

(2) Still on lay men and women, shouldn't we be open to what's been going on about us in the appointment of them to our boards of trustees? No reference here to the Maryland Court decisions on State aid, I'm simply suggesting there's wisdom in recognizing that seminaries are the responsibility of the entire community, Catholic at least. And if in specific instances, corporate or canonical law precludes trustee status, then we should look to some form of advisory board. But make sure that the advising goes well beyond the informal. There's need of a structured

forum, with regular meetings, with visits to the seminary, with interviews of staff and students and parents. The lay trustees and/or advisors need, first, information; then something to do. I wouldn't want them simply as window dressing to show how avant-garde my institution is. The worthwhile lay men and women don't want to be "used" in this way; those who permit it aren't worth having in any capacity.

Parenthetically, let me suggest from my own problems as a combined rector-guardian-museum director-cemetery operator-public relations man-and-teacher that too much priest-time is spent unwisely. I wonder if in seminaries we employ enough secretarial help and employ it creatively? The director of a research institute once advised me that more research resulted when he hired four secretaries for his staff than when he hired one—the men pressed themselves to greater activity to keep the clerical employees occupied. It's a thought for us.

(3) Seminaries need bigger and better libraries. There has to be appropriate representation of what used to be "Index" books. Non-philosophical subjects must be stocked. Again, a library in today's educational thinking is not "for display only." Books, journals, tapes, records, art prints are for use. Certainly they are costly. But it is really needful that the seminary college itself actually own all of them? Is inter-institutional cooperation impossible? I think not both on account of what's actually being done and on account of the breed of person a librarian is—a servant. And I wouldn't rule out the use of public libraries and nearby school libraries. Maybe if more seminary faculty members and students used these they'd have a better academic image in the total community.

(4) Still on the informational or academic, seminaries should afford broader learning experiences by sponsoring and/or participating in "culture." I know not every lecture is worth listening to; there is a danger of overprizing the "lecture circuit" wherein you get something off the top of someone's head, a rehash of a magazine article, a superficial and facetious analysis. Prudence is needed in lining up speakers and performers who are able and willing to tailor their presentation to your needs. But again, seminaries need not go it alone. With a little cultivation and imagina-

tion, cooperative programs can be worked out with the local schools and institutions, chamber of commerce and service groups. The Jewish Catauqua Society and others have free speakers. We can always get on the mailing list of nearby schools that schedule speakers. There are tapes. Television and films can be used intelligently to broaden horizons and deepen appreciation.

A caution is called for. Real learnings are not effortless. Amusement and entertainment are goods in themselves but they are not equivalent of learning. Be clear on what you look for in each experience.

Let me emphasize too, that students and others should be actively involved in the selection of programs in and out of the seminary, by the seminary, and by other groups. And let us not be takers only. Seminary faculty, administrators, and even students must reciprocate by providing talks, programs, etc. elsewhere than on seminary property. They must participate actively in professional educational organizations and in civic affairs.

(5) Probably one of the most frustrating possibilities opened by Vatican II is that of multiple majors. Even though a good grounding in philosophical disciplines is required, a major is not. Individual differences in interests and competencies are admitted, as is the possibility recognized that non-philosophical disciplines can in particular persons provide the integrating factor needful for a truly liberal education. Frustrating, isn't it, to have official sanction to expand curricular offerings and to be painfully aware of the limits of small-sized faculty and student body?

Something still can be done here and now. Let's do it. A stronger voice can be given non-philosophical disciplines by creative use of the opportunities mentioned above under the rubric "culture." Part-time lay faculty can supply assistance. Courses can be taken at other institutions during the school year as well as during the summers. And we can mediate seriously on our role. There's much nonsense written about "perfect training" as a man for a future speciality but I find history majors become attorneys and college presidents; a mining engineer became the 31st president of the United States. A college after all does its job when it provides some breadth of information, a good methodology, a cautious and critical spirit in searching, a hunger and thirst for

validated information and conclusions and for the means (reading, discussion, study) that alone give these . Don't be afraid to leave something for the future, something for the individual and for other institutions. Be bold enough to cut time-in-class and to cultivate learning outside the 2 x 4 x 4 system (two covers of a textbook, 4 walls of classroom, 4 years of college).

(6) A speaker later in this convention will discuss new teaching methods and tools (team-teaching, educational TV, etc.). We'd all do well to listen openly.

(7) On the matter of regional accreditation of the seminary college, we have no need to await an expected decree of the Bishops' Committee. From a prsonal point of view, I hope the accreditation process is allowed to remain in lay hands rather than in a newly created Catholic agency.

(8) No small amount of literature calls for professionally trained counselors in seminaries. I suggest we say, "Amen," and get with the training of some or all of our faculties. Group counseling is not an impossibility. Knowledgeable advice to each student (with facts and figures in place of platitudes), guided reading programs, academically trained spiritual directors—these are corollaries.

(9) Provision can be built into seminary structures to facilitate communication and basic personal encounter among and between administration, trustees, faculty, students. Personally I feel this may be the best "first aid" of all. I don't wish to take time to explain the dynamics of basic encounter groups, T-groups, or sensitivity programs; I do want to endorse the suggestion that dialogue be built in. Whether it be by means of joint membership on committees, by student council, or what have you, is not so important as the climate of openness and the regular occasions to express ideas, emotions, and responses. All the groups that go into seminary life desperately need to know and appreciate not only the work each does but principally each other. To put it another way, less talk about what they do, more about what they are.

(10) As the persons in the seminary begin to grow through and with each other, then we can safely readjust seminary rules to encourage mature freedom, self responsibility, and so on. I put the growth first because I have misgivings about the improvement

expected in a rule-less seminary. I'm bothered because I read in Karl Rahner that, metaphysically, the most submissive subject still assumes personal responsibility for the most "obedient" act.[2] Personal responsibility is inevitable, even if not creative. under the most dictatorial system. Is not this one of the lessons in jurisprudence from the Nuremburg trials? Perhaps we should explain all this to our students and to ourselves even while we work to more humane and Christian exercise of authority and obedience.

I'm bothered, too, because such a "big deal" is made over such little things. So seniority in table seating is gone; the bells; and clerics wear watches and use the phone at their own discretion, and mail their own letters! Big deal! Why magnify these out of proportion? So students pick their own study-times and TV watching schedules! These are means only; let's not confuse them with ideals and goals. If they lessen or remove entirely the "police" role of faculty and administrators, good. But why rest content? Even in the smallest organization—if I read Parkinson's laws aright—we will have some rules with us, and administrators as well, forever. Suppose we make a deliberate effort to transform regulatory relations into personal relatedness? Much lamenting is provoked by our smallness in size. Why not capitalize on what at the moment we cannot easily change? Isn't it easier to experiment with and in such smaller groups? To create therein the sense of community conducive to maturation of both faculty and student? Can't we learn now in our present situation and so prepare for possibly different situations later? I think we can and when we do, the college seminary will be able to step, instead of stumble, into the future.

(11) Vatican II expects a pastoral and ecumenical dimension in seminary life. In elaborating on the ecumenical, Dr. Wagoner suggests a "live-in" between Catholic and Protestant seminarians.[3] What's to prevent us beginning now to experiment with the idea? If we experiment now, then we'll be better prepared for the larger idea of the future, some kind of common Christian seminary.

Related to this is the doctor's suggestion of actively seeking older vocations, especially from among university students. They would be brought to the college and theological seminary on a competitive scholarship program similar to the Protestant program

funded by Rockefeller and Ford foundations. Likewise the suggestion that the seminary college instruct non-seminarians on a part-time basis. Without going into details, we've done so at San Luis Rey College since 1963 and have had none of the predicted difficulties and more of the benefits than we could have imagined. I think our extension program one of the strengths of our college and strongly recommend you explore its possibilities in your own situations.

A final suggestion on students. We need to know a good deal more about them and how their sub-culture affects and effects their formation. Secular colleges have done socio-psychological research of this kind (a handy reference is the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education report for 1962/63). I'm told by Father Paul Reinert, president of St. Louis University, that the office of education and foundations are or can be interested in subsidizing this kind of research. We need these researched data to get the most out of our students and our seminary colleges, and to fit the two to each other.

To return to pastoral orientation, I've already warned against identifying "pastoral" and "parochial." I'd now like to recommend close study of the notion of interneship as spelled out in the D'Arcy and Kennedy book, *The Genius of the Apostolate*,[4] Pastoral orientation means a planned program and abundant critical reflection on experiences under faculty direction. It means the challenge of real situations wherein seminarians won't be "made over" too much, wherein failure is a distinct possibility, and wherein students can experience success. Multiplication of activities and a general busy-ness are nowhere near so important as the joint faculty-student involvement in common work constantly and critically reflected upon.

(12) I am pleased to find that Vatican II acknowledges the need of in-service training of ordained priests. Pleased, because the acknowledgement strips seminaries of a false sense of obligation to pretend to prepare seminarians to be priests-once-for-all prior to ordination. In effect, we're now told to ready men with information etc. to carry them through their first few years only. We're told to aim at enduring habits and attitudes—the methods,

the spirit, and the hunger—because we are obliged to follow up after ordination.

For in-service training the college can be an important institution. Workshops, study days, publications are a beginning. We can learn from Protestant programs at the University of Michigan, the Graduate Theological Union in Berkely, and elsewhere. We need not go it alone; the college is a particularly apt instrument in bringing community resources to the task and adding an ecumenical dimension. We can. Why don't we? Now!

Under the rubric "What to do until the doctor arrives," I have been thinking at considrable length of "first aid" measures. Some measures are pretty likely to be with us in the year 2000 because they are as permanent as anything in a good educational program; others are more temporary. You may have noticed that nothing was said directly to two major proposals, i.e., to combine small seminaries into larger regional and national institutions and/or to move the seminary to the campus of a general college or university.

The omission is explained in part because other papers will treat these in detail. In part, too, because overmuch concentration on these proposals too readily becomes panacea-chasing. Solid arguments can be advanced for both proposals. It seems likely that the Bishops' Committee on Seminaries will add its authority to the arguments. But I am convinced that neither amalgamation nor relocation will succeed automatically. So I made suggestions that can be put into practice more rapidly and by almost every seminary. Suggestions that will enable us to acquire experience, test hypotheses. and develop skills that we need irrespective of the size and site of the seminary. Thus armed, we'll be better equipped to take advantage of the new opportunities. We'll move confidently because we move from inner strength and conviction, not from panic and despair. When we prove ourselves in action (not in theorizing) we can expect and receive the aid of the entire Catholic community. But we must stop crying and start producing. We have a patient to deal with and things to do before the doctor arrives. Let's do them!

NOTES

[1] Francis M. Tyrrell has some important elaborations on this matter; cf. *Natl. Catholic Educational Assoc. Bulletin,* 63 (Aug. 1966), 125-135.

[2] Karl Rahner, "Reflections on Obedience," *Cross Currents,* Fall 1960, pp. 363-374.

[3] Walter D. Wagoner, *The Seminary Protestant and Catholic* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966).

[4] New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.

SEMINARIANS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

VALENTINE M. JANKOWSKI, O.F.M. Conv.

Although we might at times hope for a new way to introduce the relevance of what we are about to say without prefacing our remarks with "as we read in the documents of Vatican II," surely there can be no more sound backing for our statements than the mind and words that emanated from the Council. In language which reminds us of the "according to times, places, and cold regions" of Francis' Rule, the document on priestly formation states that "universal laws are to be adapted to the special circumstances of time and place, so that priestly formatoin will always answer the pastoral needs of the area in which the ministry is to be exercised."[1]

Since, according to the genuine missionary spirit of the Church, the legislation and suggestions of the Council were eminently pastoral, it is to be hoped that the decision to abandon the traditional collegiate department of the seminary and to study on a college or university campus was prompted by the same concerned pastoral spirit.

This paper is entitled "Seminarians on University Campus." In actual fact, it is the story of the move made by one small seminary to a large university. The particular facts of this personal case history should not detract from the general principles which I feel should be applicable in most similar seminary situations.

We begin our story in Carey, Ohio. In this little town was located, since 1934, Our Lady of Carey Seminary. The location had housed at various times seminarians at the collegiate, philosophical, and theological levels. In 1951, it became, for the Province of Our Lady of Consolation, a junior college, to which, in 1955 and 1956, were added the last two years of college. In 1955, affiliation with the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, was obtained; and our professed clerics, averaging about ten graduates a year, received their bachelor of arts degree from the University

of Dayton, while remaining at Carey and taking all their studies there.

Understandably, with such a small student body (none of whom paid any tuition since they were members of the Order) and a proportionately small faculty, one could not hope to give as broad an education as we might have wished. The province could not staff the seminary with professors capable of teaching in all the fields in which the students might want to concentrate. We had, for example, a man qualified to teach biology, but no one to teach physics or chemistry. French was offered as a language, but there was no one to teach German. Even more deplorable, especially from a financial viewpoint, was the situation of our library and science laboratory. Even rather generous outlays of province funds could not begin to update our facilities sufficiently. The University of Dayton itself was not satisfied with our limited provisions, and we made new efforts at improvement.

We hired men and women to assist us in teaching. We boasted a Methodist woman teaching Latin, a Presbyterian minister as professor of American literature, a practicing psychologist from a nearby town as lecturer in psychology. During both the regular school year and during the summer sessions, we transported clerics to Bowling Green State University, located forty miles from Carey, that they might take courses there. And to give our classroom situation at home a more catholic outlook, we opened our doors to laymen and women who might care to take advantage of the courses and credits that were offered them. This last move, we hoped, would increasingly involve us as servants of the local community, enabling us to give to the people of the village something the local community had not been able to provide.

Yet, professors and students alike were not satisfied with the situation. We felt that our measures were for the most part "stop-gap" and ephemeral. During the years 1963 and 1964, a survey was made by the rector of our seminary, Father Juniper Cummings. A questionnaire was sent to two hundred seminary rectors and two hundred academic deans; institutions were chosen at random from the Catholic Directory so that places of all sizes and in all locations of the country might be contacted. Five possibilities were proposed, and the recipient of the questionnaire was

asked to give his choice in the order of preference. The five choices offered were these:

1. the establishment of a small religious house (75 students, 10 professors) situated near a large Catholic university with professors teaching in and the students attending the university,

2. the establishment of a small religious house situated near a large state univerity campus with professors teaching in and students attending the university,

3. the establishment of a religious house affiliated with a large Catholic university but a hundred miles distant from it,

4. the establishment of a religious house affiliated with a large Catholic university but near a large state university for purposes of educational atmosphere, use of library, interchange of professors, and

5. the establishment of a small religious house attempting college accreditation for a four-year liberal arts course.

One hundred twenty-four academic deans and 81 seminary rectors responded to our questionnaire. Seventy-three per cent of the former and 65 per cent of the latter favored the establishment of a religious house near a Catholic university. Number four, the establishment of a house affiliated with a Catholic university, but near a state university, received the approval of 13 percent of the academic deans and 12 percent of the seminary rectors. The accreditation of one's own seminary was approved by 12 percent of the rectors but by only 2 percent of the deans. The actual situation we were in at Carey was favored by no dean and by only three rectors.

Armed with this information and now bold in the mailing of questionnaires, we wrote to twenty-one colleges in the midwest to see their views on having seminarians studying on campus. We also wrote to ten communitites of men who sent their students to open colleges. All the colleges expressed interest in having seminarians on campus; all the religious superiors but one felt that their communities were doing a good thing in educating their young men on campus.[2]

Encouraged by the morning mail we were constantly receiving, the next step was taken. At the next meeting of the large definitory of the province, the Carey situation (which was not un-

known to the men of the province) was explained. Father Juniper, as provincial prefect of studies, revealed the results of his questionnaire to the assembled Fathers. He presented the facts and proposed the solution. It was unanimously voted by the members of the definitory that we abandon our little Garey seminary and look elsewhere for a place at which to educate our young clerics.

More detailed investigation showed that of all the colleges and universities we had inquired into, St. Louis University looked for us at the moment most promising.

God seemed to be answering our prayers and those of the *Helpers of the Holy Souls* when we were notified that these good Sisters were eager to sell their old convent located at 4012 Washington Boulvard in St. Louis. The place was too large for the depleted community of sisters, and it was just large enough to meet the needs of our soon-to-be-transported Carey community. Our man in Saint Louis, Father Angelus LaFleur, who had left our Carey friary eighteen months before we joined him in the big city, reported favorably on the location.

After several visits to the place by the minister provincial the province purchased the property and we made ready to move.

The property consisted of the main convent building which would house, without too much comfort, thirty-five or forty young men, a chapel of more than sufficient size, a building adjoining the convent which could serve as a recreation center for the clerics, a small guest house, and a fifth building which has since been converted into a convent for the four White Sisters of Charity who so well care for the domestic needs of our friary.

Without a doubt, the property was old. The novices who were professed in July of 1965 and who went straight to St. Louis must have had to swallow hard and think of the reality of at least one aspect of poverty when they recalled the million dollar novitiate they had been living in and saw the old bricks and the drab walls of their new home. But, with some supervision and much youthful enthusiasm, they set to work painting and cleaning. They were soon joined by their elder confreres who came from Carey in late July and August and assisted with broom and brush. By September the Negro tenant across the street was able to say

that he was glad we had moved in since we were improving the neighborhood.

When we first thought of moving to a university campus, we hadn't given much thought to the apostolic possibilities of the location. But that situation should not be glossed over in a young seminarian's life, and indeed our very address urged us to be concerned about the needs of our fellow citizens.

We found ourselves located about five or six blocks from the University, close enough for walking to school, and far enough away to enjoy something of the privacy and identity that is necessary for community life. Other religious communities had also moved to campus; some were living as a group in domitories owned by the University and subject to the regulations of the school. The neighborhood in which we lived was old. The population, both white and colored, across the street from us and on the alley behind us, indicated by their own standard of living that we must be witnesses to the virtue of poverty. Their very destitution in many cases would embarrass us followers of the poor Christ, and the door bell which had summoned many a kind Helper of the Holy Souls to look after the needs of the "down and out" did not cease ringing just because there were new dwellers in the old house. The students were instructed to give everybody something: food, clothing, rarely money, or advice. The latter gift was not to be laughed at; many people found that knowledge of such things as food stamps, employment agencies, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, etc. was the beginning step toward improvement in their lives. We soon became aware that God's holy poor are very often taken advantage of; their ignorance is utilized for the advantage of the greedy and the unscrupulous.

The area was wealthy with opportunities to serve, and quite generously our clerics have given of themselves, getting involved in catechism teaching, Bible schools, remedial schooling for adults, boy scouts, Great Books programs, playground supervision, visiting shut-ins, etc. In most cases the work was done under the direction of local civic and religious groups. While, as I said earlier, such apostolic work was not the foremost intention we had in mind, it certainly became an issue to be faced and em-

braced. It goes without saying that the generous spirit of charity which one morally expects to find in a candidate for the priesthood was given ample opportunity for expression.

With summer cleaning and painting nearing completion and with apostolic challenges left and right, September came soon and our men found themselves faced with the prospect of standing in long lines to register at college, with purchasing books, with determining schedules. More than the ordinary student, they seemed to look forward to this. After all, they had been healthily critical of our past condition and hopefully enthusiastic about the new.

From the beginning, they realized that as seminarians there were certain subjects in philosophy that were necessary. Since all students at the University in the arts and science college were required to take fifteen (now twelve) hours in philosophy, the two extra courses we demanded, in history of philosophy, were not too burdensome. We also asked each student to get at least an elementary course in psychology and sociology, subjects which most students elect to take sometime in their career anyhow. Finally, we required all to take (if they were good students) two semesters of Latin. For beginners in the language (we had accepted some clerical postulants who had not been to a minor seminary), we required four semesters. Aside from these courses, the individual cleric was free to determine his major and minors or his major field of concentration.

Several of the friars continued to major in philosophy; the younger ones, especially, for whom the field was more wide open, selectd biology, history, mathematics, sociology, English, to name a few. For men who frequently had spent five years and upwards together in a classroom, it was a revelation to be separated from the group and to find themselves one in a new group of twenty, or, in the case of some of lecture courses, one in two hundred and fifty. At the end of the first semester, half the students' names appeared on the Dean's List, a tribute to their hard work, to the sincere intellectual drive they possessed, and to the better than average high school education most of them had received in our minor seminary. So well have the clerics continued to achieve that the Academic Dean will allow our postulant ap-

plicants who have not scored the desired composite "20" on the ACT test to enter the University, on the assumption that the rather ideal study conditions and atmosphere of the friary will promote satisfactory scholastic achievement.

One of the priests stationed at our friary helps to guide the clerics in the choice of his program and course of studies. The very capable are encouraged to take more than the regular load; several students are in the honors program, several are working in the four-year master's program. One friar, who graduated at the end of three years, will be operating next year on an assistantship program, the stipend he receives going to aid his confreres in their education.

Everyone knows that a seminary education has to be paid by someone, and moving to a college campus does not solve the expense problem. In fact, more money in terms of cash has to be expended in the new situation than in the old. At Saint Louis University, we as a community were able to avail ourselves of the forty per cent discount on tuition. With thirty or forty students, even granting the discount, the tuition bill each semister is high. Seven hundred and fifty dollars per semester is the charge made to the ordinary lay student. (Incidentally, one of the great advantages of moving to a state university campus is that of low tuition rates.)

But men make money. And the faculty of our Carey seminary was composed of men who were capable of gaining for the community salaries elsewhere. At the time of the dissolution of the Carey seminary, three men accompanied the clerics to Saint Louis. One of these taught full time at the University and two taught part time. The remaining five were released for duties elsewhere in the province. It was hoped that the time would come whn the priests stationed at the friary in Saint Louis could, by their services and especially by their teaching at the University and other schools in the area, carry the major financial load acquired by our sending the clerics to the University. To date such a hope has not been realized. In the meantime, those men who are teaching are giving of their knowledge to more than the tiny classes they once had in the seminary; and those who are not teaching are assisting the province in various other fields.

Robert J. McNamara, writing in the April 8 issue of *America,* indicates that in the discussion of the value of the traditional seminary, two basic points come up for question. One is the college education of the seminarian, a point which seems in the case I am relating, to have been the chief concern. A second pivotal problem is the social growth and development of tomorrow's priests. It would seem reasonable to expect that a young man aspiring to the priesthood might be able to gain from association with those whose goals and ideals are at least in some respects different from his own. Likewise, he might be able to be somewhat of a leaven in the dough and give, even at an early age, witness to the kingdom for which he stands.[3]

In an age when responsibility is stressed, and rightly so, we cannot expect to produce mature and dedicated priests by catering to their, that is, the students' lacks and weaknesses. By experience we grow to maturity, and there is no reason to believe that, given a spirit of generous sincerity, coupled with proper motivation and loving guidance, a young man cannot achieve a high and praiseworthy degree of maturity in the circumstances of ordinary college life. As a nation, we seem to presume that further education, with all it entails, is an apt means towards producing a citizen aware of the reality within and around him and capable of responding adequately to it.

To be sure, the immature person who embarks upon a college career as a seminarian will need help and direction. The very weak and vacillating may succumb to the enticements of a world somewhat different from that they knew before in the "closed" seminary. But I honestly wonder if we really want such weak characters within the ranks of the priesthood or if we dare to presume that at age twenty-six they are suddenly going to blossom forth in the rarest and most desired of priestly virtues. It has been my experience, in the short time in which I was associated with our campus venture, that the ones who left us were the ones we most likely would have lost anyway. If we direct our program and regulate our lives to protect the few rather than promote the well-being of the many, it seems that the purpose of law as a help for the common good is failing to be achieved.

Obviously, there are limitations that must be placed on the

seminarians' social involvement, and these would seem to come from a knowledge of the friar's life. As one dedicated to his studies, certain extra-curricular activities, such as varsity sports, would seem to detract from his chief purpose in attending a university. His commitment to celibate chastity precludes engagement in some college-sponsored social affairs. Like his older brother in the priesthood, the seminarian while being a man of the people, always remains and must remain somewhat apart. But to prohibt a seminarian from belonging to the French club because there are girls in the club or to forbid him to speak to young ladies on campus seems to me to be ridiculous. Am I naive in thinking that a generous young man who has answered a call to a priestly vocation and who has completed a year of novitiate and embarked upon a Christian life in vows will so soon and so easily relinquish the life he has committed himself to? I am of the conviction that for the majority, the college situation will only serve to deepen their dedication. While it may well be necessary to point out the dangers to which the college seminarian is exposed, to presume that he cannot handle the situation is an insult to his dedication and sincerity.

To solve the practical problem of clothing young college men in attire that is both neat and inexpensive, and to enable our seminarians to be somewhat of a witness by even their external dress, we arrived at the following campus dress: black trousers (stay press type are neat, modern, and easy for Sister to do up), white shirt (preferably wash and wear, also for Sister's sake), black tie, and black blazer with our own distinctive emblem, indicating by color and design our commitment to two worlds. A sense of community and identity seemed to be achieved by the use of such dress; its practical value remains unchallenged.

It need hardly be mentioned that a setup with seminarians on campus calls for a rather drastic revision of the community schedule. With friars having classes at various hours and in various places, it was not posisble nor desirable to impose the old seminary schedule upon the newly established Saint Bonaventure Friary in Saint Louis. And yet we are not dealing with collegians who happen to be Franciscans but rather with Franciscans who here and now happen to be in college. Community

life, with its exercises of prayer, meals, and recreation, could obviously suffer and suffer greatly. Careful consideration and a call for cooperation was necessary to achieve the best possible house schedule. We arrived at something like this:

6:15 Rise
6:30 Lauds, Meditation
7:15 Breakfast
5:15 Conventual Mass, Vespers
6:00 Dinner
9:00 Meditation, Compline

Certain friars frequently volunteered to get up a little earlier for matins; several were present at noon for the litttle hours. The Sisters had a hot buffet lunch prepared at eleven and kept it warm for at least two hours, so that all had a chance to get home between classes and eat a decent meal. Some students scheduled their classes all in the morning, others in the afternoon, each to his liking and ability. One or two were not able to make the conventual Mass each semester; they would participate at the Sisters' Mass early in the morning. Once a month on Saturday we had a morning of recollection, twice a month a conference by the spiritual director, daily a homily at Mass. The annual retreat was held between semesters, in January. An inter-seminary association was set up by the seminarians of the various communities; once a month on Saturdays they assembled, at several different locations, for a concelebrated Mass and refreshments. They strove to promote activities of educational, cultural, and recreational benefit and hoped by their mutual cooperation to lend a more united strength to the tasks they were faced with on and off campus.

The friars themselves realized the need for community spirit. Their recreation room continued to be a source of relaxation of body and spirit. Their traditional parties did not cease with our move to campus; they even managed to produce four intramural plays in the course of the year. Christmas and summer vacations, when the call to campus activity was reduced, found the friars happy to be together and quite willing, after a year of study, to resume former activities such as painting and repairing,

directing vocation week for our prospective minor seminarians, and assisting in various catechetical projects.

Instructions from the Holy See on the establishment of seminaries have always emphasized that the priests into whose care the education of clerics is entrusted must be consistently outstanding examples of wisdom and charity, and I feel it to be a sign of healthy situation in which the students are not satisfied with less than holy and learned men to be their guides.[4] We priests and clerics were privileged to have been associated with Father Juniper Cummings who was one of the chief instigators of our move and the founding father of our new friary. Never satisfied with one good accomplishment, he felt much more had to be achieved. Hardly had the school year begun, before he initiated on our property a course (the first of eight to be offered in a four-year program) in theology for the laity. More than just a review of the essentials of the faith for adults, the course was attended by fifty laymen plus a number of our own clerics who were able to satisfy some of the college requirements by taking the course in their own house. The University did not give credit for the courses taken, but it did recognize them to the extent that our clerics were thereby exempted from up to six credit hours in theology. It was heartening to see that the new interest in theology on campus included our own seminarians in its scope.

Among the chief benefits offered by a University are the various lecture series, movies, and programs. That the students might take advantage of these and other educational and cultural advantages of the urban area, they are given two dollars pocket money each month. The small sum keeps them aware of the fact that we are supposed to be poor men; the fact there is a sum helps them to develop a sense of appreciation for the features they choose to pay and attend. In a short time, the friars learned to find many valuable occasions for extra-curricular education and diverions that required little or no money. Opportunities of all sorts quickly presented themselves, and the clerics shared with one another their good fortune in many areas.

A religious seminary has to concern itself with achieving a formation of its students according to the particular needs of a nation. It has likewise to renew itself in its members with the

spirit of Christ and of its founder, in our case, Saint Francis. Whereas we can hope we have begun to achieve something of value in both these areas, we remain always conscious that we are forever beginning, and always just beginning, to renew all things in Christ. Although in so many ways, not without its own inherent problems, our venture on campus has seemed to be a happy one, it and those who participate in it must constantly be searching for what is good and beautiful and true—goals certainly worthy of man who strives ever to know and to love.

NOTES

[1] *Decree on Priestly Formation,* 1, *Documents,* p. 438.

[2] *The Seminary Situation.* Reports of the Seventeenth & Eighteenth Annual Meetings, edited by the Inter-Province Conference of the Friars Minor Conventual. Published by the Conference, 1967, pp. 144-148.

[3] "Seminary Education: Separate and Unequal," *America,* April 8, 1967, pp. 533-536.

[4] *Decree on Priestly Formation,* 5, *Documents,* pp. 442-443.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSON IN SEMINARIES

MARTIN PABLE, O.F.M. CAP.

It is certainly a sign of our times that this conference is devoting one of its sessions to personality development in seminarians. Discussions of intellectual and spiritual development have always been standard at meetings of this kind; but a paper on "the development of the person" is a recognition that the seminary must be concerned with the total growth of the students entrusted to it. It is significant that the Vatican Council's *Decree on Priestly Formation* states that while the norms of Christian education are to be maintained in the seminary, they should be "properly complemented by the latest findings in sound psychology and pedagogy."[1] And it goes on to say that "By wisely planned training there should also be developed in seminarians an appropriate degree of human maturity."[2] Obviously the Council is reminding us here that one cannot be fully a priest without being fully human; and further, that the seminary has the responsibility to promote the personal, human growth of the students.

Much is being written nowadays on the influence of the "seminary atmosphere" on the development of the students. I refer you to the writings of men like Eugene Kennedy and Paul D'Arcy,[3] James Michael Lee,[4] Robert Brooks,[5] and Andrew Greeley.[6] These writers have given excellent descriptions of the external, sociological dimnsions of the seminary and how these can be modified in order to foster more mature development. I have no intention of going over the same ground again. Rather, I want to focus on the seminarians themselves—their inner needs, their strivings, their fears and doubts—as I have come to know them in my three years' work as consulting psychologist for several seminaries. I also want to offer some more or less specific suggestions as to how those in formation may promote greater personal growth. Otherwise, if we lose sight of the real needs of flesh-and-blood seminarians, we are in danger of rushing into all kinds of changes in external seminary discipline, and miss the whole point of it all.

In thinking about the development of seminarians, I find it very helpful to use the framework of a modern personality theorist, Erik H. Erickson.[7] He has made a meaningful synthesis of the notion of Freud together with later developments in psychological theory and research. He conceptualizes human development as taking place through eight successive life stages, from infancy to old age. Each of the life stages is characterized by a specific developmental task or "crisis" which must be mastered successfully if the individual is to mature properly. Now, considering our clerics as college students and theologians (roughly, from age 18 to 26), they would span the years of late adolescence and young adulthood. For Erikson, these are two different life stages, each having its own task to be met and mastered. For late adolescence, the crisis is that of "identity"; for young adulthood, it is that of "intimacy."

Erikson sees identity formation as a crucial phase of psychosocial development. It is during adolescence that the individual must integrate the various and often conflicting forces within himself so that he gains a sense of inner continuity and sameness. In doing so, he must bridge the gap between what he was as a child and what he is about to become. He also needs to reconcile his concept of himself with the community's perception of him. In a word, he must define himself psychologically: who am I? what do I want to be? how do others regard me? If he succeeds in mastering the identity crisis, he will experience a deep sense of well-being: he will have a healthy self-concept, a clear perspective of the future, and an inner assuredness of recognition from others. He now perceives himself as a unique and worth-while person. In recent years, Fr. Walter de Bont has done a masterful study of how the identity crisis is experienced in the novitiate.[8] It is easy to see how a young man would lose his sense of "inner continuity and sameness" when he leaves his familiar world behind, exchanges his clothes for a religious habit, changes his own name, and is told to "die to his old self." And my own experience is that the crisis is not fully resolved in the novitiate; it is gradually worked through during the college years, and should certainly be settled by the time of final profession.

Erikson calls the next developmental stage "Intimacy vs. Isola-

tion." Here the task is to achieve true and mutual "engagement" with another person, usually of the opposite sex. Crisis arises because the young adult's identity formation is usually not yet crystallized. He still experiences a peculiar strain, as if involvement with others means fusion, a loss of the identity he has struggled so hard to achieve. This causes a tense inner reservation, a caution in committing himself to others. If this tension is not resolved, the youth may isolate himself and enter only stereotyped and formalized interpersonal relationships; or, in repeated hectic attempts and dismal failures, seek intimacy in inappropriate ways and with the most improbable partners. (Anyone who has seen stiff, impersonal seminarians, or sentimentally affectionate ones, will recognize what Erikson is saying here). On the other hand, successful resolution of this crisis frees the person for genuine intimacy with others, in the form of friendship, love, dedication, leadership, and inspiration.

It should be evident that the two stages of identity and intimacy are not sharply divided, but overlap. But chronologically, they span the years when our clerics are in seminary formation, through philosophy and theology. So I would like to use the remainder of this paper to discuss their personal development in terms of those two life stages. I will discuss first the growth of the individual's self-concept, then his peer relationships, and finally the sense of identity and competence that he gains through experiences in the apostolate.

The Self-Concept

One of the surest marks of healthy identity formation is a positive and realistic self-concept. That is, the individual both perceives and accepts himself pretty much as he is in reality—without distortions, without serious blind spots, without self-rejection, without smug complacency. In a word, he makes peace with himself. He knows himself and is reasonably satisfied with himself, though he realizes, like Elias, that he still has "a long way to go." So many seminarians do not enjoy this precious gift. One of their commonest complaints is that they do not know themselves; another is that they do not like themselves. This is truly a curious phenomenon. These are intelligent young men, well conditioned.

by their whole training, toward introspection. Why do they feel so out of touch with themselves? My own hunch is that they have been over-directed. We have spent so much time drilling them to think and behave in certain ways, and left untouched the really significant part of themselves—their feelings and their personal ideals. These can only be reached from within.

This is why we need directors or masters or clerics who are truly skilled in the art of counseling. I am thoroughly in agreement with Fr. Adrian van Kaam when he recommends that the term "religious counselor" be substituted for "spiritual director."[9] Granted, words themselves are not that important; but they can help communicate a message. In this case, the message is that people, and especially seminarians, are in much less need of direction than they are of counseling. The word "counseling" suggests the *active* participation of the seminarian in the interview, a participation which helps him to discover his own insights and to resolve his own problems. It is growth from within, not molding from without. Certainly, counseling does have a directive function.[10] At times the counselor must challenge ways of thinking and acting, point out distortions, give information and advice. But this will always be far more effective if the seminarian can be helped to come to these insights himself and work out his own solutions.

As the seminarian opens himself more and more to the priest-counselor in an atmosphere of warmth, respect, and understanding, he discovers more and more of his true self. He begins to see, for example, how much his family background has shaped his present personality. He may realize, perhaps for the first time, that his fearful attitude toward authority figures has its roots in his relationship with a stern father. Or he may find that he still competes for the center of attention, just as he did as a child. He may see that he has even repressed some of his more noble strivings, because he does not want to appear "proud." These insights are often painful at first, but as he comes to accept them, he experiences a new feeling of freedom and growth in self-understanding. His sense of identity is gradually being crystalized. And he begins to realize more deeply what it means to be a seminarian, a religious, a Franciscan.

To facilitate this growth process is primarily the responsibility,

as well as the privilege, of the director of clerics (though, as will be shown later, the other faculty members can make a significant contribution). But this demands that the director be not only well-intentioned and virtuous; he must also be professionally prepared. He needs a good grasp not only of spiritual theology, but also of human psychology. And it is not so important that he have an attractive or overwhelming personality; what does count is that he be skilled in the sensitive art of counseling. I personally find it utterly amazing, no to say disturbing, that there is not a single recognized, professional, degreed program in the whole of North America for the preparation of novice masters and mistresses, and other persons in religious formation. I feel certain that at least one of our Catholic universities would be able to set up a program leading to a master's degree in religious counseling. Such a program could include courses like the following: psychology of personality; psychology of motivation; psychology of vocational development; psychology of religious development; abnormal psychology; psychological testing; theory and principles of counsling; techniques of counseling; supervised practicum in counseling; group dynamics; theology of the spiritual life; history of Christian spirituality; contemporary approaches to spirituality; and special problems in religious counseling. And, since religious formation affects the mental health of so many people, I would not be at all surprised if the federal government would be willing to give financial help to get such a program started. Perhaps this conference could establish a committee to look into this matter. At the very least, I think we should make a start in our own back yard: I'm referring to the fact that there is no center on this continent where those in formation can make a deeper study of Franciscan spirituality. As the man said in the midst of the New York City blackout last year: "Something should be done about this."

Peer Relationships

So far I've been focusing on the seminarian's task of achieving a sense of personal identity through growth in self-knowledge. Now I want to consider the other crisis to be mastered during the seminary years: the sense of intimacy with one's fellows. In discussing this life stage, Erikson stresses the point that true intimacy

with others cannot be achieved unless the person has pretty well worked through the identity crisis. If he is not yet sure of who he is, he is not ready for mature and satisfying relationships with others. This is why, when adolescents rush into early marriage, they are trying desperately to establish their own identity, not give themselves to each other in genuine love and sacrifice.

But once the individual has established a healthy self-identity, he tends naturally to turn outward, to look outside of himself and contemplate the reality of other persons. Now that he begins to understand himself, he wonders about them. He becomes fascinated by the mystery of the other person. What is he or she really like inside? What are his ideals, his hopes, his fears, his sensitivities? He seems to be a lot like me: I wonder if I could get to know him better, to share some of my thoughts with him? This desire to share, to communicate, to exchange—not just abstract ideas, but personal thoughts and feelings—this is a strong natural tendency in persons of college age. This, plus the maturation of sexual drives, provides the natural basis for heterosexual love that terminates in the profound intimacy of marriage.

The seminarian, of course, has renounced his right to intimacy in the sexual sense. But he does not renounce his need for intimacy as such; nor does this simply evaporate. If things go normally, this need will be fulfilled through relationships with his peers in community. Inevitably, of course, this brings up the whole question of friendships among seminarians and religious. Much ink has been spilled (and blood boiled) over this issue. No other, perhaps, is so charged with emotion. This is regrettable. I often wonder what lay people would think if they knew how much fuss we make about something so natural and normal as friendship.

It seems to me that once we begin thinking about friendship simply and naturally, it will cease to be a problem. All we have to do is avoid two extremes. One the one hand, we have to stop exaggerating the dangers of friendship. If there is anything that is going to retard or even wreck the development of persons in the seminary, it is an atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and guilt. The only things that can grow in such a climate are defensiveness and hostility—hardly Christian virtues. To try to frustrate the natural need for intimacy in seminarians will only backfire. If we do not

help them to develop mature and healthy friendships, they will either develop unhealthy ones, or they will become social isolates, stunted in their capacity to love.

On the other hand, I have seen too many well-intentioned people react to the situation by over-glamorizing friendship. This is not normal either. When you get done reading some of the lofty articles on this subject, you get the feeling that friendship is some kind of "eighth sacrament," practically necessary for salvation. People are made to feel abnormal unless they can go out and "find a friend" (the very expression smacks of artificiality) in whom they can confide absolutely everything about themselves. If there is one quality essential for true friendship, it is that it grows spontaneously; it is not forced or artificial. Usually it arises on the basis of mutual attraction and common interests. People find they have a lot in common, and they become friends: it's as simple as that. Moreover, this can have various degrees. I may have four or five people I consider close friends, yet I have a greater degree of intimacy and sharing with some than with others. But all the talk about finding "that one person" with whom I can form a total "I-Thou" relationship, is in need of some demythologizing.

Besides spontaniety, other qualities of healthy friendships should be discussed with seminarians. For one thing, friendships are by their very nature special: I feel a certain closeness to some that I do not feel with others. It is unrealistic to expect people living in community to have no special relationships, to "treat everyone alike." But this does not mean that a friendship is exclusive, in the sense that the friends cut themselves off from the total community. There is nothing more inappropriate than two seminarians spending hours and hours together in shallow, sentimental dialogue. This is unhealthy, not directly because of sexual dangers, but because the members isolate themselves from the organic body; this destroys the very notion of community. Another thing that characterizes true friendship is that there is mutual and free sharing between the friends. They talk freely about thir background, their mistakes, significant people and events in their lives, spiritual insights, and so on. But this is never done in an atmosphere of coercion, where one probes the other's psyche, or feels obliged to share intimate confidences, so that they may

"stand open and naked to one another." Anything that violates the psychic freedom of the person is a distortion of friendship. Similarly, one who is forever making excessive demands on the other in the name of friendship, be it in terms of time or sympathy or jealousy, is violating his freedom. Call this dependency or domination, but not friendship. Finally, the relationship between friends is characterized by a warm personal interest. "Cool detachment" is hardly the climate of friendship. But for seminarians and religious, the warmth of psychic intimacy must never be allowed to degenerate into physical or sexual intimacy. This does not mean that the appearance of sexual feelings necessarily vitiates a friendship. Seminarians have often been frightened away from a potentially healthy friendship by suddenly or gradually finding themselves sexually attracted to their friend. This is not necessarily pathological. Here a sensitive director will be able to help the seminarian work through this problem without panic, so that he learns to accept and deal with these feelings without giving into them.

Granted, then, that personal friendships are a natural and normal way for seminarians to achieve the task of intimacy. But I do not think this is the only way; and I would go further and say that in a seminary community, it *must not* be the only way. The seminarian's renunciation of an exclusive love is not merely a sacrifice to be endured; rather, its positive value is that it frees him to love all mankind with the charity of Christ. In a certain sense, then, he must achieve intimacy with the whole human race. A couple of special friendships in the seminary will help him toward this, but they will not be enough. Friendship is not the only way of loving. He must learn to widen out, to open himself to others in ways that may be less personally gratifying, but are more priestly. And the logical place to begin to develop this kind of intimacy is in the seminary community itself.

It has often been remarked, for all their living together, seminarians seldom really know one another. For various reasons, they learn to repress and intellectualize their feelings, they hide their true selves behind masks of indifference, hyperactivity, or hilarity. This is why, when they begin their apostolic work, they find themselves ill prepared to understand the real needs of real people:

they are so used to dealing with others only on a surface level. The present-day reaction to this formalism and distance is the yearning for a deeper experience of "community"—a greater sharing of personal thoughts and feelings in a group setting characterized by acceptance, respect, and absence of threat. When such an experience is complemented by a dynamic and fully participated liturgy, it can be a tremendous force in building up a truly fraternal spirit. This goes far beyond the shallow "togetherness" one sees so often today, where people think they are "forming community" by strumming a few guitars and singing "Here We Are. . . ." During the past year I conducted an experimental program in which I taught a class in mental hygiene to fifteen college clerics who had just completed their novitiate. I would spend the first twenty minutes lecturing on some mental health principle, then we would devote the rest of the hour to group discussion. It was most gratifying to see these young men open up to one another, giving and receiving understanding, support, encouragement, and occasional correction, without bitterness or sentimentality. There are many ways of using group experiences like this in order to deepen the sense of community in the seminary. "Dialogue" is a terribly overworked word, but it's a wonderful reality; it's the only way people really come to understand each other. A little book like Howe's *Miracle of Dialogue*[11] should be required reading for both director and clerics before they start having group discussions. And there is no reason in the world why religious ideals and values, including Franciscanism, should not be the subject of group dialogue. Research has shown that learning is often much more significant and profound when is occurs in such atmosphere.

But it is not only with his peers that the seminarian must achieve intimacy; it is also with the faculty members. His relationship with them will necessarily have a somewhat different quality. Nevertheless, faculty and students do form one community, and this is especially true in our Franciscan seminaries. Absolutely nothing is gained by keeping these two groups artificially separated, whether by written or unwritten law. In fact, a great deal is lost. Besides being directly contrary to the family spirit of religious life, such separation deprives the students of needed contact with mature adults who can serve as role models

for them. It has been pointed out time and again that the surest way to help people mature is to have them interact with other people who are mature and healthy. Now I do not think this implies total living together. I do not believe, for example, that forcing the faculty to recreate with the students or sit at table with them is necessarily going to promote community. There are such things as natural groupings of people which we do well to respect: the faculty members have common interests and concerns which the students do not have. Still, there is room for more meaningful interaction in our seminaries. Certainly, the faculty should feel free to mingle with the students informally when they want to. But apart from that, why could they not share, for example, some of their apostolic experiences with the students? This could be done, either by taking some of the students along on their apostolic work, or by giving an occasional informal talk on their work, discussing a piece of research they are doing, and so on. It is important that the students see the priest, not just in the classroom setting, but in his total role as priest. And from the faculty member's viewpoint, this kind of informal contact with the students is the best way of keeping alert to their mentality.

The Apostolate

Let us turn now to a third source of personal development in the seminary. We have been discussing development in terms of the seminarian's need to achieve identity in himself and intimacy with others. Besides self-knowledge and peer relationships, growth in both identity and intimacy can be greatly facilitated by another factor: the seminarian's own experiences in the apostolate. We must never forget, nor must we let the seminarian forget, that he is preparing for a definite life's work, a specific profession—the priesthood. This vocational identity cannot be divorced from his personal identity; and it calls him to a special kind of intimacy with the entire people of God—the intimacy of loving service.

The Vatican Council's *Decree on Priestly Formation* is very concerned about this apostolic or pastoral dimension of seminary training. The whole training of students, it says, "ought to provide for the development of true shepherds of souls after the

model of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Therefore, every program of instruction, whether spiritual, intellectual, or disciplinary, should be joined with practical implementation, and directed toward the pastoral goal."[12] Obviously the Council is calling for in integrated formation, wherein classroom learning is complemented by field work experience (as in other professions), in such a way that "the whole seminary program . . . may be structured as a kind of introduction into the life which the seminarian will live as a priest."[13]

Again, if we look at this matter from the viewpoint of the psychological needs of the seminarian, it will be very apparent why he needs this experience. One of the hallmarks of a healthy sense of identity, as Erikson points out, is a feeling of self-confidence. The seminarian has a deep need to feel assured that he is competent to handle the role and work of a priest. From the point of view of intimacy, he needs to feel assured that he accepted by other persons outside of his community, and that he can establish appropriate relationships with them as a seminarian. "Can I function effectively in the apostolate? Will I be accepted by the laity? Can I really love them, in the sense of responding to their needs more than to my own?" These are the real questions that seminarians grapple with. And there is no more effective way of answering them than by testing themselves out in the field of apostolic work.

This brings up the question of what kinds of work are appropriate for seminarians, and how much time should be devoted to them. These are matters that can best be resolved by experimentation. I would like to suggest, however, that the apostolic experiences should be graded in some way, or related to the current concerns of the seminarians. Thus, for example, it would seem to me that during the college years these activities should be more in educational fields, rather than in directly pastoral works. I have in mind things like teaching underprivileged children, or supervising cultural and recreational activities for youngsters. Above all, I think seminarians should have frequent contact with other college students, of different faiths and of both sxes. These should not be just casual and haphazard, however. But they could, for example, take some classes in nearby colleges, attend their

special educational and cultural programs, plan a joint study day or institute to exchange ideas, and so on. The presence of young women on these occasions can help the seminarians to understand and appreciate the feminine mentality, and to develop confidence in their ability to relate maturely to the opposite sex—to strengthen what psychologists call their "psychosexual identity." Another helpful kind of apsotolate in the college years would be visiting the sick, the shut-ins, those in nursing homes and mental hospitals. This kind of experience can do much to develop the seminarian's humaneness, his sense of compassion, and his need to deepen his spiritual life in order to be of real help to people. Then later, during theology, the seminarians should be introduced into the more directly pastoral forms of apostolate. Here is the place for such things as teaching religion, parish visitation, adult education in religious topics, liturgical functions, and counseling.

However, here a serious warning must be uttered. Apostolic work, no matter how good in itself, will not *ipso facto* contribute much to the seminarian's development. I'm afraid that too often today we think that just "sending them forth" is going to make seminarians more mature and more prepared for the priesthood. This is another myth. Experience for its own sake is of limited usefulness at best. It can degenerate into mere busy-work. What does promote growth and learning is *supervised* experience. Here the seminarian, after engaging in some apostolic work, comes back to discuss his experience with a mature and understanding priest. And he discusses it not only in terms of what he did and how successful he was ("objectively"), but even more important, he evaluates it *subjectively,* in terms of his own feelings, attitudes, and motivations. This is what fosters growth in self-understanding and self-confidence. This is where significant learning takes place, where mistakes are accepted and turned to profit, where faulty attitudes are discovered and worked through.

In their book *The Genius of the Apostolate,* Fathers Kennedy and D'Arcy have a brief but superb chapter entitled "Apostolic Work: The Expression of Vocation and the Test of Growth."[14] This chapter should be pondered carefully by everyone involved in seminary formation. In one part, the authors contrast the su-

pervision of apostolic work in the seminary with supervision of trainees in other professions:

> "It is interesting to note that in the training of priests there is close supervision of the seminarian's private life but practically no supervision of his professional life. In other professional training (medicine and psychology, for example) there is close supervision of the student's professional life and practically no supervision of his personal life. . . . These latter kinds of works (the apostolate), in seminaries where they do exist, are ordinarily extra-curricular activities. The moderators function in widely different ways, but often they are figureheads who supervise the activity only in a very broad sense. This is very different from the supervision that a physician or psychologist gives to an intern in their professions. These professionals tend to look on the students as their future colleagues and successors. . . . The supervisors' demands are usually very gerat; they do not tolerate slipshod professional performances, and they probe very deeply into the intern's knowledge, skills, and motivation. The intern gets immediate feedback on his performance; his internship quickly becomes a time of real growth as he experiences, often with great pain, the challenge of matching his textbook knowledge of sickness to the encounter with human persons suffering these sicknesses. The truth of his grasp of the meaning of his life's work is not found in the medical student's quiet room. It is in meeting and becoming responsible, as a member of the healing profession, with sick human beings. Too often the truth of the seminarian's grasp of the meaning of his life's work is restricted to his quiet room. . . . When he does act as a professional religious person . . . he is hardly supervised at all. He gets no immediate feedback about his mistakes and little opportunity to profit from them. What could be a healthy growth situation is instead a frustrating and disappointing experience."[15]

The obvious remedy for this situation is to have the seminary provide ongoing supervision for the clerics in their apostolates, even if it means limiting their work. Better to have a few meaningful experiences than a lot of superficial ones. Who should do the supervision? Preferably, a faculty member who has apostolic experience and above all, has a sensitive understanding of seminarians and can help them to reflect on their feelings and experiences. This could be handled by the director of clerics, but need not be. I know of one seminary that has a priest appointed as

full-time "director of apostolic activity." Whatever the arrangement, this man must be given adequate time for the job. It is too important to be left to chance.

Conclusion

I have tried to sketch what I consider some significant aspects of personal development in seminarians. I full realize that it is only a sketch; much remains to be filled out. In times like ours, clear guidelines are lacking in many areas of thought. The most we can hope to do is grope together and pray together for light from the Spirit living in the Church. In this Spirit, I welcome your comments and suggestions.

NOTES

[1] *Documents,* p. 448.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Eugene C. Kennedy and Paul F. D'Arcy, *The Genius of the Apostolate* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965).
[4] James Michael Lee, *"Personal and Guidance Services in the Seminary,"* James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (ed.), *Seminary Education in a Tme of Change* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965).
[5] Robert M. Brooks, "Sociological Dimensions of the Seminary," in Lee and Putz, *Seminary Education,* pp. 205-232.
[6] Andrew M. Greeley, "The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make to Seminary Training," *Bulletin of the National Catholic Educational Assocation,* LX (August 1964), pp. 47-53. This issue contains several excellent articles on seminary training.
[7] *Childhood and Society* (New York: Norton, 1950); *Identity and the Life Cycle* (New York: International Universities Press, 1959). For a fine discussion of religious development in the light of Erikson's theory, see Barry McLaughlin, *Nature, Grace, and Religious Development* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1964).
[8] Walter de Bont, "Identity Crisis in the Male Novice," *Review for Religious,* 21 (March 1962), pp. 104-128.
[9] Adrian van Kaam, "Religious Counseling of Seminarians," in Lee and Putz, *Seminary Education,* pp. 328-352.
[10] Cf. André Godin, *The Pastor as Counselor* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 44-60.
[11] Reuel L. Howe, *The Miracle of Dialogue* (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1963).
[12] *Documents,* p. 442.
[13] *Ibid.,* p. 448.
[14] *Op. cit.,* pp. 194-204.
[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 195-196.

MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGY SCHOOLS

RUSSAN COLE, O.F.M., CONV.

Since this year's meeting is particularly concerned with seminary education, I am pleased to have an opportunity to talk to you about the Midwest Association of Theology Schools (hereafter referred to as MATS). For years there has been talk of the need to "do something" about seminaries; and MATS represents a very solid bit of doing.

The association is almost brand-new. It was conceived in the summer of 1964, when a group of midwest seminary administrator-teachers invited 34 theology seminaries to meet in Chicago the following October. The basic need was to find out whether there would be any notable degree of interest in such a meeting. Everyone was amazed when, in October, out of the 34 seminaries invited to send a representative, all 34 did so.

The area covered was the area covered by the North Central Accreditation Association, a circular area bounded by Arkansas, Colorado, Minnesota, Michigan, and Ohio. Thirteen of the seminaries were diocesan (conducted by diocesan or religious priests), and 21 were religious. Five of them were Franciscan seminaries: St. Joseph Seminary at Teutopolis, Ill. (Sacred Heart Province of St. Louis), Christ the King Seminary at West Chicago, Ill. (Assumption Province at Pulaski, Wisc.), Assumption Seminary and College at Chaska, Minn. (Our Lady of Consolation Province at Mt. St. Francis, Ind.), St. Leonard House of Theology at Dayton, O. (St. John the Baptist Province at Cincinnati, O.), and the Capuchin Seminary of St. Anthony at Marathon, Wisc. (St. Joseph Province of Detroit, Mich.). It is interesting to note that this year's Franciscan Educational Conference program lists speakers from three of these Franciscan seminaries.

Three ideas were apparently at the heart of the need to assemble: there was certainly a need to bring some fresh air, some post-Vatican II *aggiornamento* spirit into Catholic theologates;

we seemed to be falling far behind the developing depth and scope of secular American education techniques and relevance; and the major seminary department of the National Catholic Educational Association did not seem to be dealing with our problems at all adequately.

The group assembled with the hope that none of the Ordinaries whose institutions were being represented would feel as though a new association was attempting to wrest control of "his" seminary from him, with a view towards offering worth-while insights to the Episcopal Commission on the Accreditation of Seminaries, and to the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Univesrities.

The initial purposes were rather simple, and, as approved of in the association's constitution later, were:

1) communication and research concerning curriculum, methods of instruction, evaluation and standards;
2) coordination of the seminaries' dealings with the North Central Accrediting Association leading towards possible accreditation, with the subsequent possibility of receiving grants from various foundations;
3) study of ecumenical proceedings, especially some kind of coordination with the American Association of Theology Schools.

From its beginning, the association began to probe the aims and objectives of a theology school. What kind of man did we hope to produce? What kind of man did we think the laity want us to produce? What kind of background was necessary for the young man entering a theology school? Were our present standards such that we were attracting mostly "soft-nosed" escapists from reality?

The question of the kinds of degrees to be granted has been debated at length in the association. It seems that almost every seminary is giving a different kind. We attempt to set up some standards whereby there would be some unanimity in our group. And we hoped that somehow we could begin to add some truly post-graduate level class to our seminary procedures. The master's degree was considered to be the kind of degree to pursue in the theology seminary (presuming that everyone would have had a bachelor's degree before starting, and that one would have had

some kind of minor or secondary area of concntration in religion or thology while in college).

Since there are numerous apostolates open to a theology seminary graduate, and since young men of greatly varying backgrounds and interests enter into the study of theology, it was thought that we should offer different kinds of master degrees and programs. The "pure" M.A. in theology would be research-oriented, and would be committed to serious depths in the subjects in the core curriculum. The Th.M., or Master in Theology, would be more practically oriented: or, better yet, would be ordered to producing priests with a serious pastoral direction—with special stress put on the social sciences, techniques of proselytizing, involvement in the causes of the day, the projection of or witness to Christ in the contemporary scene. The third degree would be the M.R.E., a Master's degree in Religious Education. Increasingly, priests are becoming involved in teaching after ordination; and such people would gain much from a program ordered towards the techniques and methodology of teaching.

The association did not itself want to become any kind of accreditation association. We felt that we should leave that to the NCAA. But we were interested in attempting to evaluate ourselves, to find out what we thought we should do to qualify somehow for official accreditation. And, therefore, it was decided that there would be two kinds of membership in MATS: constituent members would be those who had conformed to a list of standards which MATS would draw up; and the associate member would be those who were tending in that direction, but for a number of reasons just couldn't qualify as yet.

The basic difficulty with being relevant in our contemporary scene is that most seminaries are very small. Even the largest of them have only a few hundred students (and some of the smallest have almost nobody: maybe 10 or 15). Regular secular schools of that size would have difficulty with accreditation (unless, possibly, as the graduate school of a recognized university, they would "borrow" legitimacy and true depth from the mother institution). As someone said at one of the meetings, we are really all very small schools. We suffer from a lack of really adequate libraries, really adequate exposure to heterogeneous features of

our subject-matter, adequate opportunities for our students to mature as they move through the maze of possibly hundred of would-be directions for their lives, exposure to varied view-points as expressed by really outstanding men who—for various reasons —aren't able to be invited to address the student body. As mentioned by one of the MATS meetings' guest speakers, Walter Wagoner, Executive Director of the Fund for Theology Education, from Princeton, N.J., the Catholic seminary is somewhat trapped by its mother system: life is almost too structured to bloom well.

MATS moved often to a consideration of the problem of the small seminary. What can it do to up-date itself, to produce a truly relevant man of God? Almost every small seminary does realize—to some extent, at least—its inadequacy. Many would approve of a merger with other small seminaries as a start toward growth. The only trouble is that everyone is willing to have others come to his seminary; but almost no one wants to move out and join with someone else.

A growing trend is, of course, the movement of the seminary onto a university campus, such as St. Louis University. St. Mary's theology school in Kansas is doing just that; and probably others have already done the same, or will do it soon. Or small seminaries which are located fairly close to each other might find some kind of amalgamation quite helpful—with a sharing of libraries, faculty, recreational facilities, visiting lecturers, etc. When MATS decided to set up a board of review which would, on invitation, visit a seminary to see whether it was applicable for constituent membership, only 5 or 6 of the 34 seminaries thought it worthwhile to apply. They were honest enough to admit that they weren't really that well-qualified as graduate-level schools. Which was certainly most creditable honesty, but also somewhat discreditable to the kind of men they will be graduating in the years to come.

One of the most interesting operations of MATS was the sounding out of priests concerning their past seminary training. Some 8,000 alumni of the seminaries in MATS were sent a questionnaire, and were asked to report what they now felt about the relevance of their seminary training to what they are doing now.

Thirty-two schools participated in the survey. The results were tabulated by a computer, and each seminary received a report telling what all the alumni, as a group, had thought, and what each particular seminary's alumni had thought. Some 70% of the alumni responded (the survey had been sent to only those ordained 15 years or less). MATS does not want the results published at large yet—for one thing, it would require a lot of work to probe the backgrounds of those surveyed (missionary, diocesan, religious, age group, etc.), and the results might very easily be misunderstood. But each seminary did find out what its alumni had answered, and was undoubtedly given much to ponder and discuss. Probably one item of especial interest in the survey was that about three-fourhs of the respondents said that there was a great need for more emphasis on pastoral counselling in the seminary. Almost none of them thought there should be any more stress put on apologetics, or spiritual direction, or ascetical theology, or (rather surprising) the nature of love. And quite a few were of the opinion that one great change in the priest's image in the world today is that he is no longer, as such, an authority: he must prove his competence. The priests who answered the survey thought that the principal doctrinal problem they were encountering was that of proving the relevance of Christian doctrine to the modern world.

These few points are an example of the survey findings—findings which lent some urgency to the proceedings of MATS. Something has to be done to produce graduates who feel more at home in their chosen field, almost fully equipped to deal with their average problems, men who will feel fulfilled (rather than frustrated) in doing their work day-in-and-out. There is a need to produce a truly professional man. The sacramental technician, as such, will feel ill at ease among his professional peers. The survey cost quite a lot of money, and required a lot of work. But it certainly did demonstrate that many suspicions about irrelevance were well-founded.

In the summer of 1966, MATS sponsored a five-day workshop at St. Xavier College in Chicago. The theme was theology seminary curriculum. Two professors from the University of Chicago Education Department attended most of the meetings. The mem-

bers present worked hard to try to adapt seminary curriculum to present day norms. And everyone was working against the general background of curriculum codes prescribed by Rome, and by various religious groups and—I suppose—sometimes local ordinaries or scholastic boards.

Some of the general conclusions were that most theology seminaries are requiring far too many hours of class-work from their students. Whereas 12 to 15 credit hours might be considered as a norm, many seminaries were requiring 20-plus. The heavy load made graduate level work almost impossible. There was too little time left for independent study and research; too little time to expose oneself to other viewpoints on life, religion, social values; too much conformity in the thinking of the graduates; too much opportunity for the student to learn theology by rote, rather than to assimilate theology into the over-all maturing of his complete personality; too easy a temptation for the student to graduate, thinking that he has just about all the answers to everything—as we say, in truth, a lot of people not only don't know all the answers: they don't even know all the questions yet.

Dr. Norman Burns of North Central attended one of the sessions of the August workshop. The possibility of a very small seminary's being accredited by North Central was proposed to him. Dr. Burns answered that North Central isn't opposed to smallness as such: the criterion would be that of whether a small school would have enough breadth to provide a heterogeneity of education; whether the sheer logistics and finances of a Church school system would best be served by having so many small schools; whether the Church, as a system of thought, would best serve its own interests by maintaining such small schools. A small school could certainly be accredited, theoretically; practically, it would be most difficult.

In line with an attempt to up-grade theology seminary training, MATS drew up a set of standards for such schools. These standards are the areas into which in investigating team would look when visiting a school. Some of the more important points are these:

1) there should be a spirit of responsibility, initiative, and rele-

vance, with criticism and evaluation of the school's purposes, and with enough vitality for prudent experimentation.

2) There should be a continuation and deepening of the board general and liberal education required for admission.

3) The student entering should be well-trained in the liberal arts, including literature, Latin, and another language (Greek or a modern foreign language), and the fine arts; with a sequence of courses in natural science and social sciences; with basic training in philosophy, with training in college-level religion or theology, commensurate with the type of degree program planned in the theology seminary.

4) A background to life in the theology seminary should be basic mental health, provided by means of physical training social intermingling, and adequate counselling.

5) Obedience should be directed towards eventual responsibility and independent judgment.

6) There should be a genuine sense of community, so that theology may be lived in the seminary, but with room left for individual responsibility and initiative.

7) Every seminary should have a rector, deal of studies, dean of men, council to the rector, librarian, and business manager. It is understood that each of these offices should hopefully be filled by one man only (preferably full-time)—a situation which I know a lot of us would look upon as utopia, but a situation which would be seriously looked in to by a visiting team.

8) The core curriculum (theology, Scripture, canon law, and history) should be taught by men with a doctorate; other teachers should have at least a licentiate, or its equivalent.

9) Every faculty member should give evidence of continued growth by membership in learned societies, publishing, delivering papers, and by an active participation in forming educational policies in the school. Anyone without a doctorate should be encouraged to continue his work towards it.

10) For diocesan teachers, there should be set up a solid system of salary, rank and tenure, retirement or sick leave, sabbatical leaves. It would be good to bestow upon various teachers

the rank of full, associate, or assistant professor. When a religious is "donating" his teaching "salary" to the institution, his professional integrity might be enhanced by means of establishing theoretical salaries, in line with his official professorial status. A faculty handbook would be highly desirable, with—among other things—a set of rules which (alone) would make it possible to dismiss a teacher from his position.

11) The master's program may be of several types; but it should have solid depth, commensurate with its graduate character. There should be seminar work, preparation of an M.A. paper (or its equivalent), and a comprehensive examination.

12) Even a doctorate program could be planned, if the school's facilities, faculty, etc., would be adequate. MATS emphasized that this should not be undertaken without evidence that the school has established close contacts with other schools and universities in the area.

(The preceding standards were approved by MATS in general meeting on April 2, 1965.)

MATS has drawn up a "Questionnaire for Applicants for Constituent Membership." It is quite lengthy; so I won't go into it in detail. It begins by asking the school to submit copies of every publication describing the school: catalog, student handbook, self-study, faculty handbook, financial statement, completed individual form for each staff member, copy of the legal charter, copy of the seminary's constitution and by-laws.

The questionnaire also inquires into the educational background of the guidance and administrative personnel.

The examiners will carefully check the steps the school is taking to determine how well it is attaining its purposes and objectives (if these have been adequately and explicitly defined). They will want to know the number of faculty meetings held annually, whether accurate minutes are kept, whether course syllibi are kept up-to-date, whether a record is kept of student and faculty use of the library. There would also be a check of the school's physical plant, the date of the construction of the buildings, and the uses to which they are put.

I think you have a pretty good picture of what MATS is attempting to do for theology seminary training. And it looks as though the association will continue to do well. At a meeting last November, the association was honored with the presence of and speech by Archbishop Garrone, Archbishop of Toluouse, and Pro-Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities. The Archbishop expressed great interest in the work of MATS, and said that the Vatican is certainly most interested in all the help it can get from groups like this, in the formation of policy for seminaries.

MATS is sponsoring another workshop this summer, at Mundelein Seminary in Chicago. The current theme in the association, as developed in papers delivered at its most recent meeting last April, is the distinction and integration of philosophy and theology in the seminary formation. This theme will be pursued at the workshop. And, also, there will be two expanded committees dealing wih the apostolic program, and with liturgical-spiritual formation. It is hoped that we will be able to avail ourselves of some especially competent people in these fields again. In conclusion, I am sure all seminaries in the MATS area have benefitted tremendously by the proceedings of this fine new association. Many of u may still be far from being out of the doldrums; but, at least, we have become aware that we were definitely in them. I think every diocese and religious group would do well to have at least a few men well trained in education, in order that the diocesan or religious seminaries can keep up with the changing scene. Someone remarked at one of our meetings that we have currently let ourselves slip so far behind secular education, that we will have to run hard to catch up, and even harder to move on ahead with it.

Every seminary I know of is harassed by having too few men to do too much work. There is often almost unbelievable dedication. and varying degrees of methodological know-how. If, as the *Decree on Seminary Training*[1] mentions, the seminary is the heart of the diocese or province, it is certainly fitting that every member of the diocese or religious group give as much help as possible to his seminary system. There are big, big questions to be asked, and seminaries need helping in answering them. MATS cannot

of itself solve a seminary's problems; it can, however, point out that there are possibilities of solution, and hope that each seminary can work from there. Every seminary will have to solve its own identity problem, each one will have to prove its own claim to relevance. The meaningfulness of Christianity to generations to come depends to a worrisome extent on how well these problems are solved right now.

NOTE

[1] *Decree on Priestly Formation, Documents,* 437 ff.

SCRIPTURE IN A TOTAL PROGRAM

OTTO BUCHER, O.F.M. CAP.

The title of this paper is "Scripture in a Total Program." Broad as such a title is, it does point to an inescapable fact, namely, that Sacred Scripture influences seminary education at its very roots and should be at the heart of every seminarian's life and study. A topic with implications and applications so extensive, however, makes it almost impossible to do more than scratch the surface. I shall, nevertheless, try to select a few areas in which I have some personal experience and expand on these. No doubt, a number of the subjects treated in this paper will tie in with the other papers presented at this meeting, for example, the one on the theology curriculum, but I hope that what is said here will add another dimension to the discussion.

Our topic will be divided into two parts: the first dealing with the principles and theory related to the place of Scripture in the total program, and the second with some suggestions as to application and practice. The principles and theory are, for the most part, laid down for us in the various documents of Vatican II and in the statements of educators, especially those coming from our ecclesiastical superiors. There is much less certitude and agreement when we come to the application and practice. For this I have tried to discover concrete suggestions in articles by experts in the fields of education and Scripture and to synthesize the fruit of my own thoughts and discussions on the subject. In this last area of application and practice, I am sure that we all are searching for answers and would especially welcome enlightenment on any experimentation along these lines.

I. *Principles and Theory*

A. *The place of Scripture in the life of a religious and priest.* —If one of the fruits of Vatican II has been a renewed interest in the written Word of God by the whole People of God, the Church,

how much more must there be a renewed interest in and study of Sacred Scripture by our religious, students and priests. The Second Vatican Council, in the *Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of the Religious Life,* urges religious communities to turn to sacred Scripture as a source of spirituality.

> Drawing on the authentic sources of Christian spirituality, let the members of communities energetically cultivate the spirit of prayer and the practice of it. In the first place they should take the Sacred Scriptures in hand each day by way of attaining "the excelling knowledge of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:8) through reading these divine writings and meditating on them.[1]

And in the *Decree on Priestly Formation,* the Council also singles out the Word of God as the essential preparation for the ministry.

> Let these students, then, be readied for the ministry of the word, so that they may always grow in their understanding of God's revealed word, may know how to grasp it through meditation, and express it through word and conduct.[2]

Finally when the Council deals with the knowledge that the priest should have in the *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests,* it again gives the primary place to Sacred Scripture.

> The knowledge of a sacred minister should be sacred, since it is drawn from the sacred fountain and is directed to a sacred goal. Hence that knowledge should be drawn primarily from reading and meditating on the Sacred Scriptures.[3]

Sacred Scripture, then, must be part and parcel of the life and thinking of every religious, seminarian and priest. While professors may continue to argue about which course is more important, the essential place of Sacred Scripture—I purposely say Sacred Scripture and not the *course* in Scripture—is beyond question, especially since Vatican II.

The role of Sacred Scripture in the seminary cannot be limited to the course in salvation history, exegesis, or even biblical theology, nor can it be limited to the biblical material used in the other seminary courses, but it must first and foremost be viewed

in context of the *whole Christian life.* From this we can draw our first principle, one that should be obvious but is in practice often overlooked, namely, in the ordinary seminary formation the student should receive a biblical training which is at least comparable to that given an educated Catholic layman at that stage of his development; in fact, it should be superior not only on the graduate level in the house of theology but throughout the seminary training.[4]

B. *The place of Scripture in the seminary course of study.*—Although in the minor seminary the study of Scripture is dictated almost exclusively by the exigencies of Christian life, the role of Scripture in the major seminary is also immediately connected with the very subject matter of dogma, morals, liturgy, preaching, etc. Before going on to an investigation of the Scripture course itself, we can ask what is the place of Scripture in relation to its sister theological sciences?

First of all, in the broader problem of the integration of philosopy and theology it seems that the study of Scripture must play an important part. For Vatican II has stressed that philosophy and theology "should work together harmoniously to unfold ever increasingly to the minds of the seminarians the mystery of Christ, that mystery which affects the whole history of the human race."[5] This integration, then, is between faith and reason, between revealed truth and human scientific truth, and ultimately between God's spoken word found especially in Scripture and God's created word found in the world and especially in human intelligence. As we shall see below, most plans for the integration of philosophy and theology involve biblical history and biblical theology.

Within the theology course Scripture plays a vital role. Bishop Garrone (now cardinal), the pro-prefect of the S. Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, in an address to the Italian Biblical Week, September, 1966, stated that he believed that the whole problem of renewal in theological studies depends on the place given to Scripture in seminary teaching.[6] He insists that seminary studies be up-dated pastorally and admits that much of our priestly formation has been fragmented and divided into isolation areas so that the seminarian feels frustrated when he is faced with adapt-

ing to the practical needs of the ministry. His knowledge has been so dispersed and disintegrated that he does not see how the various subjects are related to each other and to Christian life.

Bishop Garrone goes on to say that theology must recover its unity, its center, and then adds:

> Now this center is the word of God, that is to say, the teaching of Holy Scripture. The inspired Scripture, containing the word of God, the teaching of the apostles, is truly the heart of the Church's Tradition, the center to which all the rest must be referred. It is no rhetorical exaggeration to say that today we have the grave obligation to restore this important place to the Scriptures. The future of our seminary studies depends on this. Scripture study should become the explicit point of reference for all the other branches of study which should receive their specific character precisely through this reference.[7]

Actually this is nothing more than an elaboration of what Vatican II teaches in various places. In the *Decree on Priestly Formation:*

> Under the light of faith and with the guidance of the Church's teaching authority, theology should be taught in such a way that students will accurately draw Catholic doctrine from divine revelation, understand that doctrine profoundly, nourish their own spiritual lives with it, and be able to proclaim it, unfold it, and defend it in their priestly ministry. . . .
>
> Dogmatic theology should be so arranged that the biblical themes are presented first. . . .
>
> Other theological disciplines should also be renewed by livelier contact with the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation. Special attention needs to be given to the development of moral theology. Its scientific exposition should be more thoroughly nourished by scriptural teaching.[8]

The *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation* is even more explicit:

> Sacred theology rests on the written Word of God, together with sacred tradition, as its primary and perpetual foundation. By scru-

> tinizing in the light of faith all truth stored up in the mystery of Christ, theology is most powerfully strengthened and constantly rejuvenated by that word. . . . The study of the sacred page is, as it were, the soul of sacred theology.[9]

Similar statements can be found with reference to the importance of sacred Scripture in the study of the liturgy,[10] in ecumenism,[11] and in the ministry of preaching.[12] In this connection I recommend especially the book, *Dogmatic vs. Biblical Theology,* and in particular the articles by Karl Rahner on "Exegesis and Dogmatic Theology" and by Edward Schillebeeckx on "Exegesis, Dogmatics and the Development of Dogma."[13]

Perhaps we can formular a second principle: the various subjects taught in the major seminary curriculum should be presented in such a way that the students "see how each point of study is related to a deeper penetration of their faith and to the task of communicating it to others."[14] This is done by making Scripture "the explicit point of reference for all the other branches of study."[15]

C. *The course of Sacred Scripture in the seminary.*—So far we have examined the place of Scripture in the whole training of the seminarian and then in the theological formation of the student. Now we come to the course in Sacred Scripture and ask what is to be expected of it in light of Vatican II. Bishop Garrone asks the pointed question: "Is the actual Scripture teaching in our seminaries able to meet the challenge? Some people have expressed serious doubts."[16]

Scripture should be taught in such a way that it becomes the central point of reference, the source where faith is kindled and from which it shines to penetrate the teaching of all the other subjects with its illumination. But at the same time the study of Sacred Scripture must be scientific and this scientific aspect cannot be left merely to the specialist: the linguist, the exegete, the professional theologian.

Fr. Myles Bourke, at the Second Christopher Study Week, in 1965, pointed out two reasons in favor of the scientific study of Scripture in the seminary:[17] (1) the priest must prepare for a ministery to an ever-growing number of Catholics who have gone through college and university. These people expect theological

and scriptural competence in their clergy; this is especially true in any dialogue with non-Catholic clergy, most of whom have had a good scientific training in the Bible. (2) The priest is a minister of the Word; his duty to teach and preach that Word of God demands more than training in the techniques of effective public speaking. It is the content of his preaching that is most important and that content must be the biblical message. In order to have a certain amount of ease and self-confidence in this matter, even the ordinary priest must be trained in the fundamentals of biblical scholarship, both for his own faith and to preach it to others.

The Council in its *Decree on Priestly Formation,* insists on both the scientific and spiritual character of the Scripture course:

> In the study of Sacred Scripture . . . students should be trained with special diligence. After a suitable introduction to it, they should be accurately initiated into exegetical method, grasp the pre-eminent themes of divine revelation, and take inspiration and nourishment from reading and meditating on the sacred books day by day.[18]

The Council, no less than previous statements of the Holy See, has stressed the importance of studying biblical languages, archaeology, texxt criticism, and especially the method of literary criticism. Through all this, however, Bishop Garrone warns those who teach Scripture that: "Their fidelity to the technical, scientific exigencies of their teaching should not result in depriving Scripture of its position as the centre which illumines all theological teaching."[19]

II. *The Application and Practice*

Again I repeat that there is much less agreemnt here and much more room for discussion. For the most part this section will simply present some suggestions or ask some questions on possible avenues of experimentation. As far as order is concerned, I shall begin with the last mentioned area, the actual course of Sacred Scripture, and proced in inverse order.

A. *How does one achieve the purpose of the Scripture course?* When does a course become too technical and just what should

be stressed to make the course more effective in arousing the faith of the student and in preparing him to use it in his other studies, his prayer life, and his apostolate?

Fr. Eugene Maly has several suggestions: "Among the introductory subjects an increased importance must be . . . given to the history of Israel. I am more and more convinced that the seminarian will be able to appreciate the significance of the inspired words only when he can relate them to their full historical background."[20] Fr. Maly also stresses that the total scriptural picture often presents a fuller meaning than that contained in several texts taken separately; this demands that "in exegesis increasing emphasis will be given to biblical theology, . . . the treatment of biblical themes according to their historical development."[21] Among such themes might be mentioned: the Exodus,[22] the covenent, election, eschatology, creation.[23]

Another important attitude that should be conveyed to the student is that "the word of God is always addressed to a present audience in a current situation and can never be relegated to antiquity."[24] In other words, Scripture was not meant to satisfy our curiosity about the past. "It can never be sufficiently emphasized that most of the Bible was written in view of the actual problems that were facing men of their age, in order to give them help and encouragement in concrete situations of life."[25] It is the permanent message that mut be abstracted from the culture and situation of that time and translated effectively in terms that are vital and meaningful today.

Finally the Scripture professor mut take to heart the criticism of theologians which is summed up so well by Karl Rahner in his article, "Exegesis and Dogmatic Theology."[26] In particular he chides the exegete for stopping at the limits of his purely scientific investigation of the text and failing in some way to help bridge the gap between exegesis and dogma. The exegete must not merely pull out the biblical carpet from under the theologian, he must take the first steps in formulating a positive biblical theology upon which the dogma professor can build. In a way this leads us to the next question.

B. *How can Scripture be better integrated with the other courses?* Much of what could be said here is actually part of a

broader problem, the re-organization of the entire seminary curriculum. The Council does urge that at the very start of their training in ecclesiastical studies the students "should begin with an introductory course of suitable duration."[27] The purpose of such a course would be to give the student an initiation into the mystery of salvation and to help him to interrelate his studies and to see their pastoral intent. Certainly Sacred Scripture, that is, a proper understanding of its nature, its value and limits, and its relationship to reason would be fundamental to such a course. Where the novitiate was taken before the study of philosophy, this would seem to be the most logical time for such a course. Otherwise some sort of seminar before the major seminary training seems to be indicated.

Almost everyone who writes on this problem of the integration of Sacred Scripture and theology mentions that at the very least there must be "close collaboration between the professors of Scripture and of dogma."[28] "They should not be conceived as living and teaching in two wholly distinct worlds. Indeed, it would be a great advantage if the theology professors could also receive some graduate training in the biblical sciences."[29]

As a step in this direction of "collaboration" one of the most practical and initially least disrupting seems to be the introduction of special seminars in which the professors of Scripture and dogma share their respective contributions to a given topic, e.g. evolution and original sin. Other professors: the patrologist, Church historian, etc. could join in this.[30]

More drastic measures would include the full introduction of "team teaching" and/or the introduction of large sections of theology, but especially Church history and Scripture, into what is now the philosophy curriculum.[31] The questions here are rather far reaching. Should the course of Scripture be retained as a separate entity? If it should, how much of it? Should most of Scripture be taught in college? All of it? In any event, it does seem that basic courses in inspiration, biblical history and geography, and most questions of general introduction should be taken before the speculative part of the theology curriculum.

C. *How can Scripture be given a more vital role in the life of the religious, seminarian and priest?* From the educational point

of view, we have already seen that the seminarian should get a training in Scripture which is at least comparable to that given a Catholic layman at the same educational level. The opportunities for biblical formation, however, are not limited to the classroom. For the Christian and certainly for the priest Scripture is primarily a source of personal faith. "In the classroom as well as in private study, the Scriptures are being read by members of the Church, a community of faith. Because of this, we must continually emphasize that an appreciation of Scripture and its apostolic value can only come from frequent and deep meditation on the Word of God. This is something that each individual must do for himself."[32]

This personal biblical formation can be fostered in the seminary, if the student from the beginning is given a solid foundation in biblical spirituality. In this the liturgy should play a major role. But a far greater influence will be the presence of living examples of directors and professors who are also familiar with the fruits of the modern biblical movement and have rooted their faith in the Word of God. Those in positions charged with the formation of others can hardly excuse themselves from having a knowledge and love for the Scriptures which is not at least as great as that which the ordinary modern post-Vatican II priest should have. This is something that concerns not only the exegete and the professional theologian but everyone in any way engaged in seminary education.

NOTES

[1] *Documents,* p. 471.

[2] *Documents,* p. 442.

[3] *Documents,* p. 571.

[4] Cf. Ronald D. Lawler, "New Things and Old: Reshaping the College Seminary Curriculum" in *Bulletin of Nat. Cath. Ed. Assoc.,* 63rd Annual Meeting (1966), p. 149, "We should be more startled than we are to realize that theology is still frequently the most defective part of the seminary college curriculum." And a little later, "Theology needs to be stressed even more in the seminary college than in the ordinary college, because theological principles are, if possible, even more intensely relevant to the daily life of the seminarian." What is said of theology is even more true of Sacred Scripture.

[5] *Decree on Priestly Formation, Documents,* p. 450.

[6] An Allocution to the Italian Biblical Week given by Archbishop Garrone, the pro-prefect of the S. Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, Sept., 1966. The text can be found in: *Docum. Cath.,* 1967, 67-71. Quotations are taken from an English summary in, *The Clergy Monthly,* 31 (1967) 106-8.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Documents,* p. 451 f.

[9] *Documents,* p. 127.

[10] *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,* 24, " Sacred Scripture is of paramount importance in the celebration of the liturgy. For it is from Scripture that lessons are read and explained in the homily, and psalms are sung; the prayers, collects, and liturgical songs are scriptural in their inspiration, and it is from Scripture that actions and signs derive their meaning. Thus if the restoration, progress, and adaptation of the sacred liturgy are to be achieved, it is necessary to promote that warm and living love for Scripture to which the venerable tradition of both Eastern and Western rites gives testimony." *Documents,* p. 147.

[11] *Decree on Ecumenism,* 21, *Documents,* p. 362 f.

[12] *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation,* Art. 21, "Therefore, like the Christian religion itself, all the preaching of the Church must be nourished and ruled by Sacred Scripture." *Documents,* p. 125.

[13] Herbert Vorgrimler (ed.), *Dogmatic vs Biblical Theology* (Helicon, 1964), pp. 31-65 and 115-145.

[14] Garrone, *art. cit.,* p. 106.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Myles M. Bourke, "Method and Purpose in the Seminary Scripture Course" in *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary in Light of Vatican Council II* (2nd Christopher Study Week), New York, 1965, pp. 89-98.

[18] *Documents,* p. 451 f.

[19] Garrone, *loc. cit.*

[20] Eugene H. Maly, "Progress and Prospects in Scripture Studies in the Seminaries" in the *Bulletin of the Nat. Cath. Ed. Assoc.,* 60th Annual Meeting (1963) p. 64. See: Roland Murphy, "The Old Testament for Seminarians: the Purpose of the Course" in the *Bulletin of the Nat. Cath. Ed. Asso.,* 57th Annual Meeting (1960), 89-93.

[21] Maly, *loc. cit.*

[22] Bourke, *art. cit.,* p. 94 ff.

[23] The problem of a biblical theology is well treated by R.A.F. MacKenzie, "The Concept of Biblical Theology" in the *Proceedings of the Cath. Theol. Soc. of America,* 10th Annual Convention (1955), 48-66.

[24] Joseph A. Grassi, "Toward a Better Apostolic Orientation of the Semi-

nary Program of Scripture Studuies" in *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary,* p. 103.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 107.

[26] Karl Rahner, "Exegesis and Dogmatic Theology" in *Dogmatic vs Biblical Theology,* pp. 31-65.

[27] *Decree on Priestly Formation, Documents,* p. 449 f.

[28] Garrone, *loc. cit.*. . . . .

[29] Maly, *loc. cit.,* pp. 64 f.

[30] Cf. Bruce Vawter, "New Testament for Seminarians: Suggestions for an *Improved Course*" in the *Bulletin of the Nat. Cath. Ed. Assoc.,* 57th Annual Meeting (1960), p. 84.

[31] For examples of thinking along these lines: John Auricchio, "A Renewed Seminary Curriculum" in *Pastoral Life,* 15 (1967), 25-42. Also: John L. Murphy, "The Seminary College Course" in *American Ecclesiastical Review* (1966), 242-257.

[32] Grassi, *art. cit.,* pp. 100 f.

MORAL THEOLOGY AFTER VATICAN II

MATTHEW HERRON, T.O.R.

The moralist can and must demonstrate that theology does not just tolerate moral philosophy, but absolutely needs it. Catholic theology does not raise the structure of revelation and faith upon the ruins of the human intellect. History shows that moral theology has always expressed itself in philosophical terms. Catholic theology holds tenaciously to the historical fact that revelation and grace address the whole man: the law of nature exists at the interior of the Gospel invitation, which summons to perfection. What the follower of Christ chooses to perfect is and can only be his nature. The Christian call to transcend nature does not dismantle nature's own structure. The energies of grace, which are the action of the Holy Spirit, quicken to a new and fuller life the dynamisms of nature, which are resident in reason.

WHAT IS IT?—The natural law is an ordination of rational creatures to their end which is in nature itself and perceived by the light of reason. The eternal law is the seal and the natural law is its impression on the rational nature of man. We might call it an inclination placed in creatures moving them to act according to their nature. It is a participation of the eternal law in a rational creature. Natural law obligations are grounded in being; in grasping what he is man grasps what he is to become by his free determination. Man's being is a continual free gift of God; man's task as a person is to freely accept what he is as God's creature. Man in realizing his supernatural elevation and vocation does not lose his natural existence or natural obligations; rather he now sees them more clearly, both in their sources and in their end. The law of Christ which contains revelation and grace, does not destroy nature or its laws, but builds upon it. Natural law is man's *potentia obedientitalis* for the *lex gratiae*.

When in faith he understands Christ's answer expressed in hu-

man speech, Christ's words make the natural law more accessible to him. Otherwise he could not understand the law of Christ, for man grasps this only insofar as it is mirrored in natural law. The entire man, the redeemed man, in his absolute uniqueness, in the intimate relationship of nature and grace, is the one called by God.

The newness in the law of Christ is not the content of what is required, but the new kind of love, hope, and humanity demanded. Because he is a 'new creation in Christ,' the gift of supernatural grace transforms all areas of the Christian life. The Christian who does all things in the Lord not only fulfills the natural law but also the law of Christ, the ultimate sources of all law.

Since there are elements of continuity and change in man's being, a distinction must be made between moral norms based on man's unchangeable metaphysical nature and those grounded in man's changing historicity. The questionable restriction of natural law norms to those based on the unchangeable metaphysical nature of man seems to stem from a fear of relativism and an attempt to avoid its dangers by estimating what is historically changeable in man as narrowly as possible. This was held the natural law to undue ridicule.

The theology of the natural law faces many tasks not the least of which is to convey the natural law as dynamic. The natural law must always know the demands of human nature, especially of man's social nature in any given epoch and give expression to it in concrete directives. We must always recognize the intrinsic possibility of an evolutionary process in the knowledge of the natural law.

The extent to which man remains the same through historical change is a problem for metaphysical anthropology, not ethics. Precisely to the extent that man's being changes with time the applicable ethical norm may also change. In other words, the natural law is dynamic, not static; the higher man's moral culture evolves the more clearly he perceives the norms of the natural law. He sees some obligations become obsolete; others become more demanding; then he sees the binding force of some obligations upon which he previously never had reflected. Other

obligations may arise from the evolving civilization in which he exists.

The truth of the matter is man cannot come to a clear knowledge of a natural law without the help of the Holy Spirit. That is why much of the natural law is contained in revelation. Many things in Scripture are already contained in the natural law; they are proclaimed by divine positive law in order that they may be emphasized and that man may more easily and surely know them.

A NEW ASSISTANT.—Existentialism has a tremendous influence for both good and bad, with its moral counterpart known by various names such as situational, personalistic etc. It has had a good influence in calling more attention to the personal and subjective factors entering into every real moral decision, and thus assisting in the assessment of actual moral responsibility in individual real-life situations. It makes us aware of the many complications in real-life problems. It shows that a mere restatement of a universal negative precept of the divine law is never a full answer. It helps us find alternative solutions that will be morally acceptable.

Moral theology must guide man in his responsibility, his dialogue relationship with God in light of his vocation to a supernatural destiny. The recognition of the uniqueness, the individuality of the person demanding personal responsibility is the key to the expression and development of an authentic moral theology.

A SOURCE REVIVED.—Moral theologians have always recognized circumstances as a source for the morality of an act. The existential situation is a real circumstance. Existential ethics remains a necessary complement to "essential ethics," but not a substitute for it as situation ethics maintains. The general moral norms worked out in the latter must be "applied" to each particular situation in which the agent finds himself, and by this situation we must understand that historical point of transition created by the unique personality of the individual, his personal relationships, his position in his own career, and the kind of thought about general morals of which he is capable and from which his concrete moral action follows.

Then too the emergence of psychiatry and clinical psychology

as a science has occasioned the fuller examination and treatment of the subjective factors that can affect moral responsibility and imputability not only in persons suffering from neurosis and psychosis but also in mentally and emotionally normal persons.

MAN IS FREE.—Essential to the understanding of the personal approach, moral theology is an appreciation of man's freedom. What sets man apart from everything else is the basic fact that he does not "exist" harnessed to a universal natural order which totally determines the fulfillment of his nature but rather he is set in "openness." This means that he must himself realize his various historical possibilities. Man must accept his summons to personal freedom. The positive freedom (that is, the freedom for), based on this commission also entitles a "negative freedom": man's power to do this or that, to refrain from doing this or that. In realizing his personal freedom the individual human being meets with other free "independences," which can either open or close themselves to his own purposes, and which can limit the scope of freedom itself. The "freedom of choice" involved in man's spiritual personality is the condition, confirmed by revelation, for the existence of guilt (sin), and is also realized in the acceptance of justification in faith and love and in every salutary act. The existence of freedom and its realization in sin or a salutary act is defined as a truth of faith. Freedom is often in danger of being used as a pretext for self-seeking and excess, and thus in our present condition needs the external support of commandments and authority, and above all the internal support of self-discipline.

A VIRTUE RETURNS.—*Epikeia* is pertinent to the whole new approach of moral theology. Not by way of a special exception or permission but as an essential part of justice. In fact, *Epikeia* is the *quasi regula humanorum actuum;* justice demands the existence of *epikeia* because of the imperfection of human law.

There are many reasons for the recognition and the use of the virtue of *epikeia.* The relationship of the individual person to the community or society is not a relationship of complete subordination. There will always be a tension between the legitimate needs of the individual and the community. *Epikeia* prevents the total submission of the individual to the demands of the common

good. The primary law of Christianity is the internal law of the Spirit. There can be occasions when the higher law demands that we ignore the letter of the external law. Human law by its very nature is imperfect. It obliges us *in pluribus*. Positive law is not based on the unchangeable essences but on the changing circumstances. The more people are covered by the law and the greater the variety of circumstances in which they live, the greater will be the number of exceptions to the law. The rapidly changing sociological conditions of modern life only accent the need in justice for the virtue of *epikeia*. Human error can exist on the part of the lawgiver. Most Americans are willing to admit that *Veterum Sapientia* was an unjust law. *Epikeia* is not lawlessness—the sneaking out from the obligations of a positive law. Rather, *epikeia* is the response to the demands of a higher law in a particular situation. The true understanding of *epikeia* shows the relative character of human law and places responsibility on the individual Christian to be attuned to the demands of the Spirit.

A FREE WILL DEMANDS.—Personalist morality is no less demanding than a general morality or a social convension. On the contrary, it asks constantly more; or rather, as we become more free, more human, and realize more fully the task of being a person, we shall obviously make constantly higher demands on our generosity. This follows logically from the basic principle that the source of true morality lies in the conscience, i.e., in our freedom as essentially called upon to make us abandon our self and grow toward generosity and unselfishness. This is the dynamic element in morality. What may be a duty for me is perhaps not a duty for another because our situations differ, and these situations imply the degree of moral maturity and autonomy that we have reached individually. One cannot impose heroism, but every man can get into a situation which demands an heroic decision according to his moral judgment. Authentic personalist morality is by nature dynamic, open, growing in the breadth and intensity of its demands, and differing according to the individual.

Personalist morality, individually different, finds its norm in the autonomous value of the person, expresses the escape from a static group morality, in order to reach an authentic morality of the human person. This can be seen in the emphasis on the inviolate

dignity of the human person; in the affirmation of universal equality and brotherhood; in the fight for human rights throughout the world; in the movements to break down the walls between religions, classes, races, and cultures, and to reach a level at which man speaks to man as equal to equal.

This is not laxity, lack of clarity or relativism in moral matters. It does not unsettle morality; it does not open an escape hatch to get rid of, let us say, the great prohibitions of the Ten Commandments; but it breaks through the fixation, the mere legality of morality. Morality becomes personal and dynamic, and loses its oppressive negative quality. It becomes a positive and inspiring élan upward, toward a greater humanity.

MAN IS SOCIAL.—Theology must explain and interpret man's nature as a social being in more detail. Man is always the partner whom God himself has chosen, in such a way that he must realize his personal uniqueness in community of all men and in its service. God's self-communication to all men in Christ has not created a series of private saving histories for atomized individuals, but the one history of the one human race. Yet this history keeps each individual in view for his own sake; but he finds his way to himself—to himself as the person God has in view only by finding that saving community which God himself has set up and personally realizing his membership of it (Church).

TWO REALITIES ACKNOWLEDGED.—Pluralism is a term almost new to moral thology. It must be clearly understood if we are to teach the virtue of tolerance. It is the hallmark of man's creatureliness: only in God is there perfect unity; in the finite world the antagonisms within reality are invincible. In every dimension of human etxistence, not the least the social, it is neither possible nor desirable to set up a single concrete authority (only the uncontainable God is this) as sovereign judge of all social, even all human, conduct. Not even the Church regards herself as a single supreme authority, governing all human life as her proper domain. Since she teaches that both Church and State are sovereign powers, it is clear that neither is the earthly representative of God in his absolute universal power. All the powers that represent the divine majesty are regional powers (each in its own fashion), whose actual interplay, subject though it be

to formal rules, ultimately remains a secret of God's providence.

Rightly understood and practised, tolerance does not arise from skeptical indifference to truth in general, or an opinion that all Christian religions are objectively of equal validity, but from the Christian love, reverence for the conscience of others, and the realization that the act of true faith can never be extorted: that it would be immoral to attempt such a thing or to compel people to make false outward profession of any religion. Man has a natural right to an area of freedom within which he can carry out his free interior decisions. This area is limited by the same right in others. Since the State is a natural and earthly society which of itself has no duty to promote the interests of supernatural revelation and thus to offer the Church positive assistance in her task (though it may not hinder her), there is nothing in Catholic principles to prevent a civil equality for all Christian bodies today. This is the expression of tolerance that is appropriate today (and doubtless always will be) and which the Christian owes every other human being. Many cases may arise, however, where the State must protect the norms of the natural moral law in public life even against the beliefs of individuals, for here the State is only protecting the area of freedom to which all are entitled against attack by individuals.

It is evident from the very nature of pluralism, tolerance, and personal responsibility we must admit the right of each man to embrace his God-given faith in accordance with the degree he possesses the knowledge of the truth, and the possession of the grace of God.

HONESTY DEMANDS.—We have always recognized the consensus of the faithful as a source for judgments and solutions in moral problems, but it has been more a lip service than reality. Consensus, however, has really provided solutions and created principles. For instance, the consensus of good Christian people has determined the norms of modesty in dress and they have forced a restatement of the aims and purposes of the legion of decency. The emergence of the layman after Vatican II forces us to make this a vital, ever current part of the *fontes moralitatis*. The consensus of the faithful forced theologians and the Church itself in this century to acknowledge mutual love as a valid end

of marriage. It is the opinion of many that the consensus of good Catholic people is gradually forcing the Church to accept contraception as a moral reality.

OLD WINE, NEW BOTTLE.—Justice remains basic in moral theology. The Ten Commandments are divisions of justice; they signify in negative formation and death-line under which the will of God can never be found. Justice must be presented in its positive, supernatural aspects. Then, let us place less emphasis on commutative justice and more on social justice. Let us place emphasis on distributive justice; namely, the obligation to give every man his share of the common good, regardless of race, color or creed. Moral thology must frankly state that only justice formed, motivated, and animated by supernatural charity is real justice for the Christian. In fact, we must insist that all individual virtues are really distinct individual acts of love. Then every virtue will be seen in its proper light. Charity will then be seen as the Christ in me loving the Christ in my neighbor. Purity and temperance will simply reflect respect for the body as the temple of the living God. Liturgical action will be Christ in his members at prayer; at Mass Christ in his members will offer himself anew to the Father. The sacraments will be seen as a personal encounter with Christ, who meets the recipient with His gifts. Suffering will never be empty, meaningless, or negative. For He makes our suffering his own, and we are a continuation in time of his suffering endured during his sojourn on earth. Catholic action will assume its proper perspective. It will be a continuation of Christ's own apostolic activity, which is still incomplete. Moral theology must create a psychological awareness of what we are and what we possess. Moral theology must convince one and all that when we act, Christ acts. When we sin, He is thwarted. When we go to the needy, He goes. When we refuse, He goes not.

SIN IS STILL HERE.—Neither moral theologians nor anyone else can really distinguish a mortal sin from a venial sin *in concreto*. Many acts formerly tagged "mortal sins" do not really break the bond of love between God and man. A method must be introduced that will teach people that mere material sins do not place enmity between God and man.

There are many areas in the world of human acts which need

to be revisited. For instance, there is very little evidence in Scripture to maintain the position that all sins against chastity are *de facto* mortal sins. Thank God for the present advancement in exegesis. We must teach people that guilt lies in knowledge and consent—not in the mere placing of a material act. Teachers of sacred doctrine, whether they be priests, religious or laymen, must cease using the phrase: "It is only a venial sin." Sins that are called venial are truly unworthy attacks against the divine bond of love. Man called to grow in Christian perfection must be taught to avoid, conquer, overcome and destroy every habit contrary to the expression of love between God and his creatures.

All of us, I am sure, will watch with interest the denouement to discussions currently taking place on the continent: Is a child below the age of puberty capable of mortal sin? The second is the appropriate age for the reception of the sacrament of penance. Both of these problems demand the attention and reflection of every teacher of sacred doctrine.

IS A LIE ALWAYS SINFUL?—We may believe with St. Augustine that the essence of a lie is found in speech that is contrary to the mind and that as such it is an intrinsically evil thing, which is never permitted. One, however, may maintain that the essence of a lie consists in speech contrary to the mind which violates another's right to the truth. There would then be such a thing as sinless untruthful speech, commonly termed the *falsiloquium.* The lie then would be sinless if use is restricted to the situations in which theologians permit the use of the mental reservation.

If all speech contrary to the mind frustrated the faculty of speech from attaining its proper and essential object, then such speech could never be permitted; but some authors who teach its intrinsic evil, do permit it in certain circumstances. The essential and proper object of the faculty of speech is not to communicate ideas and judgments just as they are in the speaker's mind. This is only one of the objects of speech, indeed, its principal object. A study of the nature of speech in all its expressions will show that speaking one's mind is not the only object of the faculty.

The adequacy between speech and the mind is not so natural and so essential to speech that its very absence makes speech sin-

ful. It seems to us that a study of the faculty of speech as it is ordinarily used by good men in the various circumstances of life will disclose that there are instances when the lack of such an adequacy is considered to be a good thing. It is true that this adequacy is expected normally; but circumstances can arise which sometimes permit one, and even oblige one, to leave out this adequacy.

ARE THERE MERE PENAL LAWS?—Since according to the merely penal theory the obligation *ad poenam* is the more grave obligation, it automatically becomes the principal part of a penal law. According to this theory, a law would move men to act or restrain them by fear of punishments or by mere threats, but that is really not moving men by law. A law is an ordinance of right reason which authoritatively commands men to act for the common good. A sanction containing a punishment is something outside the essence of a law, added to it in order to move men whose reason might be blinded by passion. Any theory which would elevate a sanction to a point whereby it becomes the main force that a law would possess, seems illogical, but that is the effect which is merely penal law would have. Therefore it does not seem philosophically acceptable.

It seems justice demands that there be a proporion between the *poena* and the *culpa,* but in the merely penal law theory the *poena* is far more grave than the *culpa.* It is altogether out of proportion, for it binds both externally and internally, but the *culpa* binds only externally. Therefore, in the penal law theory the gravity of the penalty does not seem to have a just cause for its existence.

In a natural law society, such as the civil state, the force of the obligations which man must assume, flows from the sociality of his nature. These obligations are determined by eternal law, from which civil laws are derived. All civil laws are no more than an application of the eternal law to the everyday life of the community, according to the prudent judgment of the authorities.

IS BOXING IMMORAL?—All sports involve human acts that must be evaluated in the light of the moral law. Since the days of John L. Sullivan, few people have opposed prizefighting on a moral basis. Theologians neither knew nor reflected upon

the permanent pathological effects of boxing. In the last score of years medical profession brought forth ample evidence that provokes, demands a thorough, competent, moral appraisal of this so-called sport—prizefighting.

Boxing is a direct violation of the Fifth Commandment of God. Unless the common good demands, no man may expose himself to serious physical or mental mutilation; nor unless in valid self-defence may a man mutilate another. In boxing the contestants both expose themselves to mutilation without sufficient reason and attack each other without a just cause.

In other sports permanent injuries occur either in violation of the rules of the game or by accident. Only in boxing is an opponent viciously and permanently mutilated through the enthusiastic use of approved rules. The danger of injuries and fatalities during prizefighting cannot be eliminated. Attempts have been made but have been found impractical and useless. When the harder he hits the higher rank he achieves in his profession, how do you persuade a boxer not to hit so hard? The primary aim of prize fighting is victory by means of bodily punishment and injury to an opponent, as swiftly and as severely as fighting skill will permit. Most of the punishment is directed against the head. If your break an opponent's nose, smash it again. If you cut an opponent's eye, widen the gash. If repeated blows weaken him physically, move in for the kill. Knock him out! This is immoral. Realize, admit that, except for therapeutic purposes, one may not deprive another, even for a moment, the use of his intelligence, his most precious gift next to life itself. A knockout in the ring hardly qualifies under the title.

A contest which has as the direct purpose the violation of the human body, should appear particularly reprehensible to the Christian conscience. The brutality that boxing encourages appears especially sinister when we consider the degree of identification of the spectator with the characters in a drama. A fight is perhaps the most powerful means of bringing out the animal in man. In a world so filled with suffering and crudeness, what place is there for a form of recreation which deliberately places acts of brutality as a means of pleasure! Boxing is badly in need of an apologist.

WHAT IS SERVILE WORK?—In the twentieth century considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed, not with the law itself, but with the outmoded concept of servility enshrined in it, a concept elaborated for a social and religious milieu so different from that which prevails in the modern world. The prohibition of servile work as opposed to liberal work was well enough suited to the social conditions of earlier times. It effectively outlawed Sunday and holyday work on the great landed estates and so accomplished something of religious and social value. But the interpretation has become increasingly difficult to apply to contemporary conditions and situations. The difference between what is servile and what is liberal has lost much of its relevance, and the stress upon hard physical toil appears less important in a world in which men are generally in less need of rest from hard physical labor than relief from the monotony, cares, and frustrations involved in the liberal or common types of work by which they earn their living.

Some argue that the rest required by Sunday and holyday observance can best be secured by interpreting it with less attention to the historical question of what kind of work was once done by slaves and what kind by free men, and with more attention to the ever actual purpose of the law: which is to give man time to worship God, to hear the word of God, to recreate his spiritual and physical strength, and to enjoy family life. The preoccupation that robs man of the freedom for this is generally that involved in his daily work, whatever that may be the regardless of whether it is liberal, mixed, or servile. Hence many writers think that a work should be considered servile if it is done for a living.

Common estimation approves many actions forbidden or disputed in the past in order that man may relax both body and mind which are fatigued by non-physical or monotonous work. Manual labor is lawful, helpful, and meritorious recreation for many modern men.

MUST WE PAY TAXES?—The more common opinion is that all just tax laws oblige in conscience from the virtue of legal justice. Legal justice, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, has the common good as its object. The individual member of society is bound to work and cooperate for the common good. Society

needs tax revenue to provide for the common good. Consequently, the individual has an obligation in legal justice to pay just taxes. This theory has become more commonly held since greater attention has been paid to the relationship between the individual and society. Some speak of an obligation in social justice.

CHURCH?—AUTHORITY?—The Church, which is a supernatural gift, in its very nature demands both the organization and the authority which Christ provided in order that the Church may achieve its desired end which is not parallel to the end of the State. We may draw certain analogies between authority of the State and the authority of the Church, but certainly they are not and cannot be parallel. The end of the Church is union with God through Christ in charity; the end of of the State is the common good.

THE PRESENT CONDITION—WHY?—Unfortunately, in the age of Constantine those holding authority in the Church used their power to impose forms which resembled the secular princes' use of authority. This movement reached its full development in the canonical legislation of the eleventh century which has burdened us up to the present day. The proposed reform movements in canon law promise a more apostolic form, thank God. Authorities' prime difficulty began in the foundations of monasticism. The literate monks were few. The illiterate soon developed a child-like dependence upon the literate. This led evntually to the theory that the will of the superior is the will of God which found its perfection in the rules and constitutions of the Society of Jesus. Another factor which moved the Church to its present *modus vivendi* has its origin in the Carolingian era when the bishops became *de facto* secular princes. Immediately the hierarchy of the Church became infected with monarchial forms in customs and authority, procedures and ceremonies, dress and behavior, that successfully hides the true nature of Christian authority. That's why we still have titles, "Most Reverend," "Right Reverend, etc." The third factor is the continuous and entirely unnecessary influence of an Old Testament mentality which overshadows the fact that the Messiah has redeemed us. No longer does man go to God through the observance of the Torah or Law. We achieve life with God through the grace and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

This does not mean that the Church, which is a supernatural society, does not need laws. But it does mean that law, whether in our holy rule or in the sacred canons or in the holy name society, cannot effect the perfections of charity which Christ gives through the Holy Spirit.

NECESSITY.—For pilgrim Christians who are not yet completely under the Spirit, some external laws will always be necessary. The external law must point out the minimal demands of love to those whose sin and flesh might still attract them to selfishness and sin and not to love. But the role of external law in the Christian economy is secondary and relative. External law is not the directing principle of all Christian action, but only the indication of minimal Christian obligations. Yes, there is a danger in putting the emphasis on the Spirit and not on the law. Some Christians will always abuse the freedom of the children of God, but abuse should not take away the use.

WHY LAWS?—Law in the Church itself or in any organization approved by the Church simply serves to indicate situations in which the movements of the Holy Spirit cannot operate in man. The law simply points out the bare minimum. Laws do not operate to express love, but simply establish necessary conditions for love to express itself. Laws are essentially danger signs and guideposts, not ends in themselves. Those in authority in the Church ordinarily demand obedience to law as though positive human norms contain in themselves man's ultimate end. In the Church all too often it is the law, the rule which is considered sacred, not man. The Church, as it legally operates today, seems to indicate the Holy Spirit exists only in those who possess authority. The Holy Spirit and the task of proclaiming the Gospel exists in every Christian. The Church has need only for laws which guarantee and protect the freedom of the individual to respond to the grace of God. Every law that does not meet the standard must be repealed if the Church is to fulfill her God-given mission.

WHY AUTHORITY?—The purpose of authority, in actuality, is found in the very root of the word. It comes from *augere*—to increase. Its purpose is to bring out the talents of the individual for the common good as well as his own welfare. The main

purpose of authority is to give guidelines and to promote the use of the subject's talents. It is to open up avenues of development of the individual for the expression of his personality as a child of God destined for eternal life. An authentic authority authors, i.e. "gives the increase," provides leadership, adds true growth; it does not need or want power or position because it is too involved with the Christian potential. There is no place for hierarchical unilaterality. There should be no ordering around on the pretext of keeping order. Love cannot be commanded. The new mandate is founded on the mutuality of the Christian encounter in which every member of the body gives life to the other.

THE RESPONSE.—Obedience comes from the Latin words, *ob, audire.* Subjects must listen to the paternal admonishments and directives of those in authority, whether Church or State, but listen as a person endowed with intelligence, sociality, and an eternal destiny. They must manifest the voice of the Holy Spirit within them. Then they must give an authentic Christian response to the mandates of authority. Those in authority today must recognize man's growing consciousness of his dignity as a person, which requires that he act on his own responsibility, and therefore in freedom. His consciousness of the Christian implications of his basic sociality formed and perfected in charity—his sense of community must also be respected. The vertical relationship of command and obedience needs to be completed by the horizontal relationship of dialogue between authority and the free, responsive Christian community.

HOW THINGS SHOULD BE.—Authority must elicit from the charismatic community of Christians, the insights of each into the faith for the enlightenment of all. Since the Church is an interpersonal community, the unitive function of authority can be discharged only through dialogue. Hence, there must be room for legitimate diversities and pluralisms in literary, theological opinions, expressions of spirituality, and forms of the apostolate which will constitute an enrichment of the Church. The chief need is new structures of communication between those who hold authority and those obliged in obedience. The directive function of authority is necessary to implement, to fulfill, to achieve the goals

envisioned in the Christian community. The corrective function must operate in a medicinal fashion expressed with the fullness of Christian love.

A HINDRANCE.—A real obstacle to the proper functioning of authority in the Church is the immaturity which expresses itself in the love for authority. By "love of authority" we mean not true love but a craving for, an undue dependence upon, the acceptance and approval of those with power over us. When this craving or dependency rules a person, he is desperately anxious to please authorities. He uses any and all means of currying favor with them; from tale-bearing to servility, to complicity in crime. The same craving can express itself in bitter, continual, and senseless opposition to authorities. In these inverted forms, it suggests prolonged and grave deprivation of parental approval in early childhood.

A MAJOR TASK.—To overcome servile dependence flowing from love of authority is never easy. But what greatly intensifies the problem is a paternalistic or authoritarian system. For this system sets up a situation very reminiscent of childhood; that is, one where the superior's power is maximal and the inferior's power is minimal. Not surprisingly, the response which such an authoritarian system idealizes and rewards is a child-like response; an obedience unquestioning and uncritical; or, as we used to say, "blind obedience." The "love of authority" is an arch-enemy of community. For community means that persons live together in friendship which is worlds away from childish or neurotic dependency. Friendship *equalizes.* In the community of friendship, we are ruled not by the "love of authority," but by the authority of love.

NEEDED, ALTERATION.—There are some necessary changes in attitude that would go a long way toward alleviating present conditions which cause so much resentment. Ecclesiastical law, monastic legislation, and synodal precepts are fallible, imperfect, legislative demands which permit a generous use of *epikeia* that has neither been acknowledged nor permitted in the past. Ecclesiastical legislation tries the impossible. It attempts to forbid every vice and command every virtue. In fact, too often we have forced high ideals into severe prescriptive laws and then won-

dered why few people obey them. Laws should be formed to suit the ordinary conditions of the Christian community; some vices it must proscribe, certainly those that threaten the very survival of the Christian community. Laws should not be aimed to make men desert penitents, but to give them freedom to respond to the invitation of Christ to meet the Gospel challenge.

A BASIC REALITY.—It must be recognized that authority in the Church lies in the hands of the faithful as a whole. The people hold the authority in the Church instrumentally, imperfectly, transiently, although virtually. They must be allowed to designate men for ordination and consecration to direct efficaciously the freedom of the Spirit. The right of choice of those who preside in the Church must be returned to the people of God if the abuses of the authority are to be effectively eradicated in the Mystical Body of Christ.

LIFT THE BIRTH CONTROL CURB?—Some say the Church is irrecovably and infallibly committed to absolute prohibition of contraception. Change for these theologians would be a proof of fallibility. Others see a lack of consensus on the part of the faithful. They do not say that the failure of the faithful to put moral teachings into practice destroys its validity. But they do ask why people whose lives are otherwise moral reject the common Catholic position on contraception. The third group looks to the goods that absolute prohibitin on cntraception has sught to protect and the goals it has sought to achieve. The rule sought to protect the value of the procreative act. The rule functioned to protct innocent young life by treating every step of the process of generation as sacred. The rule operated to save the wife's personal dignity in environments where women were exploited. The prohibition reinforced marital fidelity. If these goods could be safeguarded without an absolute rule on contraception, then it might be revised if a changed environment made revision desirable.

As the brilliant historian of the question, John T. Noonan says,

> Only after 1850 did the environmental factors change which could affect the rule's validity. Changes such as the increase in population by means of control of diseases and the different legal and social status of women make the cultural environment of marriage far

from that of the Roman Empire or of medieval Europe in which the rule was framed to respond to the dangers of particular environments it might be reconsidered in relation to our own milieu.

This approach refuses to identify the rule on contraception with the content of Christian revelation. It denies that this rule, any more than that on usury, is part of the eternal gospel of Jesus Christ. The Church is always free to look again, to see if, in a new environment, the rule is still the best specification of the commandment of love. With that sense of freedom Paul VI asked his commission this question: 'Acording to what norms and in what form should the spouses in their exercise of mutual love accomplish that service to life to which their vocation calls them?' The question, it seems, could not have been asked if the third approach had not seemed open.[1]

There seems to be no Scriptural basis for condemning contraception. It does not necessarily prevent fulfillment of the biblical dictum. increase and multiply. It does no physical harm but can be a real and fruitful expression of marital love. Good Catholic physicians—responsible men—point out all medication and surgery involve two problems: helping an organizm that is defective. or controlling an organizm excessively productive. In controlling fertility medically, they feel they are simply making a provision for the good of the whole person who has no need of his full fertility potential. The way is open for the magisterium to make a benign pronouncement—a way that really opened up when Vatican II admitted marital love is an end of marriage on equal footing with procreation.

CONJUGAL OBEDIENCE?—"The husband is head of the wife." Is this a biblical dogma or simply a confirmation of a social pattern prevalent in the early Church? It seems the Pauline assertions concerning the subjection of the woman to the man are not dogmatic reactions but ecclesiastical guidance within a definite historical setting. The Pauline affirmation must be reconstructed. The domestic society to which Paul gave a theological superstructure no longer exists. at least in the United States. Justice, charity. and prudence ask us to reappraise the structure of authority in the home. Woman's place in the cultural activity, the economic life. above all her income producing power. has changed

her life, both in the public forum and in the circle of her own family. She is no longer a mere slave, child producer, or servant of her husband. The foregoing does not in itself refute the idea of the husband as head of the family, but it definitely indicates there are limits to his authority. In any case, the husband, as the representative of Christ, has a soteriological role, a saving function, with regard to his wife and children.

WHETHER DIVORCE?—A startling development is taking place among biblical scholars and moralists that seems almost unnoticed by the general public. These men maintain that the Pauline privilege was sufficient grounds for divorce in the early Church but is not the sole condition that justifies divorce. It is only one of many conditions which would justify the Church in declaring a marriage null and void and allowing individuals to remarry for the sake of their faith. They claim the Church has simply not used its authority. Most of these scholars cannot accept Pospischil's exegesis in his recent book *Divorce and Remarriage.*[1] However, they say this same biblical text, given a more accurate exegesis, will still permit divorce in many cases other than the Pauline Privilege or the Privilege of the Faith. I personally believe the real obstacle is the canonical principle: "presumption favors the bond." How can we presume mere children involved in a shotgun wedding have given the full marital consent necessary to create a valid marriage? Years, months and days of work lie ahead for the pioneers who are investigating this all important question. Thank God a beginning has been made.

ABORTION?—When does human life begin? The Church has maintained up until now that we must accept the safer position that human life begins at the momen of conception. At the present moment good. conscientious scientists ask: "Is this true?" They do not believe the theological presumption, that is our working principle, is really valid. Their proposed theories cannot be transferred into a working principle right now. It looks, however, as though they will bring compelling proof to the fore that the old Aristotelian-Thomistic principle is true. It will be interesting to watch the developments in this area. Both the public and the Catholic press will keep us informed; and probably great, violent controversies in the schools, in the parish, and in

the hierarchy will take place with vehemence. Let us try to remain calm and cool and prudently weigh the pro and con arguments as they appear in the public press. Let us remember that we do not have now, nor have we ever had, any certainty in this matter. We have simply maintained the safer position in view of our reverence for the sanctity of human life. Reports persist that there will be a scientific, biological breakthrough in a few years that will make the practice of rhythm in marital relations absolutely certain. Recent articles in scientific journals indicate the exact day of ovulation will be determined by a simple test such as diabetics use daily.

THE LAST WORD.—Let me make this final observation. When ecclesiastical authority forbids or discourages public debate on a pertinent question such as the use of contraceptives, that does not forbid and perhaps cannot forbid discussion on an academic level which is the only real source of development. Moral theologians must contribute to the solution to a problem through mutual exchange of ideas with one another and with students.

NOTES

[1] John T. Noonan, "Authority, Usury and Contraception," *Cross Currents*, 16 (Winter 1966), 74-75.

[2] Victor J. Pospishil, *Divorce and Remarriage* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

THE APOSTOLIC OR PASTORAL FORMATION OF FUTURE FRANCISCAN PRIESTS

RICHARD BERGERON, O.F.M.

In the *Decree on Priestly Formation,* Vatican II outlines the major rules which must preside over the formation of priests. The basic principle underlying the whole decree is the following: "Every program of instruction, whether spiritual, intellectual, or disciplinary, should be joined with practical implementation and directed toward the aforementioned pastoral goal."[1] This principle is once again found in paragraph 19: "That pastoral concern should thoroughly penetrate the entire training of seminarians."[2] This principle must encompass the whole organization of the period of the formation of tomorrow's priests. The seminarians are not destined to become scholars or specialists in certain branches of knowledge; they are intended to become pastors, i.e. men capable of bringing the Word or the Kingdom of God to contemporary men.

In the application of this principle, an extremely important remark of the Council must not be forgotten: it is that the rules pronounced in the *Decree on Priestly Formation* concern directly the diocesan clergy; hence they must be applied, with the necessary adaptations, to all others preparing for priesthood. As for the Friars Minor, this adaptation is demanded by the particular exigencies of our Franciscan ideal and *forma vitae.* Thus at the threshold of this reflection on the apostolic formation of pirests, we are made aware of a further, weighty problem: that of our Franciscan way of life and of our Franciscan apostolate. What is the meaning of Franciscan apostolate? Do we have specific apostolic tasks? Are there tasks which are better applied to our ideal? Are we jacks-of-all-trades, the handy-men"? Does the expression "Franciscan apostolate" qualify only the particular spirit which must inform our apostolic activities? Is the Franciscan apostolate individual or rather communal? Must not our Franciscan apos-

tolate be primarly Franciscan before it is sacerdotal? There are many problems which are far from being solved, but nevertheless, these problems are directly at the core of he subject we are treating. Our whole concept of the formation of future Franciscan priests and the total organization of this period of formation is preceded and affected by the very concept we have of Franciscan apostolate. In consequence, I consider that this problem must be the preliminary object of study for all those responsible for formation, before initiating a profound educational reform.

When God speaks, he speaks to men. The Word of God is destined for men. The pastoral ministry of the priest consists in giving a human orientation to the Word of God, or, according to the terms of the Council, in "representing Christ before men . . . and in becoming the servant of all."[3] The pastoral life lies in serving men, and no one is exempted from this service, for the priest "has obligations toward all men."[4] However his pastoral activity must first and above all pertain to the poor and the little ones, because it is with them that Christ identifies himself and their evangelization is the sign of messianic work.[5] The pastoral ministry is hence a service to men, to all men, and principally to the poorest and desparately abandoned. And the whole seminary formation must consist in making priests men of God capable of realizing the human and evangelical service in favor of the men of today.

Thus it seems that the actual priestly formation reflects in its structures and outlines the ancient and archaic medieval ideal. As soon as Christianity ceased to strike an intensive blow in the heart of men through a too complete integration into temporal society, as soon as faith became hereditary and atavistic, Christianity became a *religion.* From this has therefore sprung a *cultic* priesthood founded principally on the service of worship and the administration of sacraments. The clerical formation consisted in preparing a wholly *cultic* minister for a community characterized by its unanimity in faith. Hence the importance of canon law, casuistry and the all important examination for jurisdiction. Formation created a fertile soil for developing a highly institutionalized and structured priesthood; this concretely implied a strongly regimented formation of monastic style, stressing and

insisting upon obedience, submission and the repetition of the same exercises, in other words, the regular life.

I have the impression that the structures of formation in many of our seminaries remain strongly scarred by this concept. Keeping this in mind they are inadequate. For we can no longer be asked to form *cultic* priests, but apostolic priests which the world of today demands and needs, since we are no longer living in a Christian environment. In contrast with the *cultic* priesthood which is founded on the service of worship, the *apostolic* priesthood is founded principally upon mission and evangelization. We are living in a pluralistic and secularized world in which the faith of the Christians is constantly menaced and put into question. The Church finds herself more and more being torn asunder by a situation of diaspora, by a situation in this world which has scattered and trod upon her sacredness by refusing to recognize the values of faith. A new type of pastoral work must come forth. This pastoral activity is principally centered upon evangelization and not upon *sacramentalism* as before; it requires a new type of priest and, of course, a corresponding formation which will envisage a total renewal of its structure—a formation which will be an education of faith since the young theology student possesses a menaced faith and since we must thing of preparing a priest who will be forced to confront a world in which Christian values are seemingly absent. The actual priestly formation has lost its pastoral dimension precisely because it does not form men capable of accomplishing apostolic work which they are faced with. We often see the young priest, fresh from his ordination, so distressed by the demands of our present world.

This inadequacy of our present formation results from three causes: 1) a theological teaching which is outdated; 2) the absence of a truly apostolic commitment on the part of the students; 3) a milieu of life which is deficient. Our effort of adaptation must stress these three points.

1) The end of theological studies is a preparation for the pastoral work. Pastoral activity, even thought it pursues the same goal across the centuries, is nevertheless conditioned in it forms by the historical situation in which men live. This means that each era or historical situation of men commands an appropriate

pastoral ministry, and in consequence an approriate theology. This is to say, each era must have its theology, and history shows us that this has been so ever since the Fathers of the Church right up to the baroque post-tridentine period. The actual theological formation is a remnant of post-tridentine theology.

We must have the courage to recognize that even after the efforts of an *aggiornamento* our theology has not yet escaped from its post-tridentine influence. The scholastic structure of present theology is altogether incomprehensible to contemporary men. The student is afflicted by being forced to submit to theological studies as an actual burden imposed upon him. He has the impression that he is doing time in listening to long discourses on the nature of angels, on interminable controversies concerning grace, on the infinite science of Jesus Christ, etc. He is constantly assailed by this arsenal of concepts and questions which are to him unintelligible and the knowledge of which seems to him quite irrelevant. But this accumulation of abstract information, this head-stuffing is a dead weight which will be hurriedly forgotten once the studies have been completed. If at least this effort was of some use. . . . But the priest cannot preach what has been taught him in the seminary. No one would understand him. The content of our theology comes nowhere near the level of life in which the preacher must move. There is a gap, an enormous disproportion between theology and the existential situation of man. Our actual theology does not give the priest the capacity of rendering the message in terms of our time. God is not dead; our theology is only sick. It has lost its pastoral orientation which is its proper end.

We must have the courage seriously to think over this problem which is so complex. The solution to this problem does not reside in a simple reorganization or restructuring of theological studies; neither does it reside in a simple redistribution of diverse dogmatic trestises and theological matters; nor does it reside in a simple alleviation of certain questions of the program. We are not concerned with a pedagogical question; but rather, in my opinion, with a reappraisal of seminary theology, i.e. with an integral revision of the whole theological teaching, starting from the point of view of the end itself of seminary theology which is

to prepare for a pastoral life in relation to our time. I cannot say what will be the exact end result of this global revision; but it seems that it will imply a concentration of the multiplicity of subjects or treatises around focal points which draw the interests of contemporary pastoral needs. This theological teaching must not necessarily cover the ensemble of theological matters, but it should be structured from the bases of the pastoral demands of our times, in which the faith of the Christians is imperilled and also encircled by a secularized world.

Our theology is sick because it is no longer pastoral. A healthy theology is a pastoral theology. By pastoral theology, I do not mean a theology in which we would treat once in a while a pastoral question or in which a pastoral course would be integrated or even, as in the present case, a supplementary year of pastoral studies. We are all well aware of the relative failure of this special year of pastoral. Pastoral theology is a theology which is considered in view of the actual problems and structured from the very base of its pastoral end. A pastoral theology is not one which is satisfied with reflecting on the eternal content of the mystery of God and salvation; it is one which strives to make ever more manifest the *meaning* of the divine mystery for man. A pastoral theology is always aware of the questions of man and his time. In last analysis, an authentic pastoral theology is a living theology.

When I speak of pastoral theology, I do not speak of a second rate or poor theology. Theology will not truly be pastoral unless it is more *scientific.* Rahner writes: "If we wish theology to take on a character more frankly pastoral, in the sense of an attention and proclamation of faith addressed to men of today as they are, it must gain in depth, that is to say that it acquire in the end a more 'scientific character' "[6] By "scientific" character he means that theology must form priests in such a way that they may work scientifically, i.e. to render them capable of thinking clearly, to give them a kind of *sensus fidei* before new qeustions, to use the true sources which nourish their teaching in such questions, and to possess enough knowledge to be able to complete easily and surely their science from this previous base[7] For all theology to become pastoral, an enormous task of

translation must therefore be accomplished by the very existence of the profound chasm between actual theology and the spiritual situation of man today and the pastoral demands which result from these.

2) The pastoral formation would be incomplete if it were merely limited to the intellectual and abstract level. The seminarians need, as the Council says, "to learn the art of exercising the apostolate not only in theory but also in practice. They have to be able to pursue their assignments both on their own initiative and in concert with others. Hence, even during their course of studies, and also during holidays, they should be introduced into pastoral practice by appropriate undertakings."[8] These apostolic activities will have the advantage of not only informing their studies and spiritual life, but also of conferring to the pastoral formation a concrete and realistic dimension.

We must be careful not to consider this apostolic commitment as a concession to the impatience of the young, as exceptions which are tolerated with reticence because they upset the regular life of the scholasticate, or again as a mere derivative of the intellectual life. No, these apostolic activities are not the sidelines of formation; and we must cease to look upon them with suspicion or condescension. These apostolic activities must be integrated in the educational structure of the scholasticate, because they are an integral part of the formation of the priests. We must strive to find the stable equilibrium between these apostolic activities and the intellectual and spiritual formation. If this balance is kept there will be a mutual influence and beneficial osmosis across these three domains.

These apostolic activities must also not be viewed as the experiences of a dilettante. These activities are not directly to be considered as an anticipation of the future ministry; this would be to play the priest. These activities are not directly means of priestly maturation. They must achieve by themselves the immediate goal of answering and responding to the concrete neds of the Church and the world of today. The tasks are so numerous and urgent, that it is intolerable that big "boys" remain candidly enclosed in a monastery and live in a desiccated intellectualism as well as in an egotistic spiritualism. These apostolic activities must be

directly accomplished in order to answer true necessities and real needs. This is, in my view, the primary condition to be fulfilled if we do not wish to see these activities degenerate into a dilettanism of experience; and if we wish them to be vertiable means for pastoral formation.

The second condition is the guidance of the professors. The professorial corps, or a team of professors, must approve or choose the activity in relation to the recognized demands of the Church and the world; and according to the needs and capacity of each student, and also according to the exigencies of our Franciscan vocation. This guidance seems to be indispensable. The educators have to consider this practical initiation to the apostolate as a part of their responsibility. They must accept an active part in this, always having in view that the young are not to be considered as simple performers who must, in order to attain the ideal image which has been imagined for them, enter into a certain mold of pastoral activity.

That this may not remain a pious wish, this apostolic task would have to be integrated into the educational structure. We should put forth a system destined to stimulate and coordinate thes activities that we may all, educators and students, feel committed to a common effort of concrete pastoral formation.

3) The pastoral failure of our clerical formation resides finally in the deficiency of the milieu. By milieu, I mean the set of conditions of life of the students, and the legal, canonical and material frames in which formation is given. It is evident that the structure of milieu in the present life of the student is still considerably in view of forming cultic priests. The cultic priest is one who dispenses the sacraments, preaches from the pulpit, administers a considerable material good. He does not go to men; men come to him. His church is the place in which his pastoral ministry is dispensed. The cultic priest is an officer of the cult; he belongs to a determined social caste.

But, as I have said before, we must form apostolic priests. The apostolate of the apostolic priest is to carry the message of salvation to harried Christians and to the unbelieving world. His ministry will consist less in the administration of sacraments, but more in evangelization. He must carry the message of salvation;

but he can no longer do this in authoritative fashion. The form that the pastoral ministry of the apostolic priest must take is the dialogue. Men no longer come to the priest; the priest goes out to them. His place of ministry is the world itself. The apostolic priest must go to men in order to establish with them a veritable dialogue. This dialogue supposes first of all a network of favorable psychological conditions; it then supposes a profound maturity in the priest—a maturity which, in the terms of the Council, manifests itself principally by a certain balance of spirit, the aptitude for ripening one's decisions and a right judgment of events and men.[9] This dialogue supposes finally a *presence* among men of today. This presence would imply to a certain degree the sharing of the conditions of life of contemporary men. The apostolic priest must ever be in a state of dialogue with the men of his time.

This implies a profound revision of the milieu of life of our students in theology. We notice that the acual milieu still retains many monastic aspects. It is in schism with the world; the young feel isolated from the rest of the world. They sense that they are in an abnormal situation. Their way of life is artificial because it has shrunk from the existential situation of man. Thus, they are bourgeois living in great estates, in big houses; they have their own church, their own library, their own professors, their own swimming pool, their own skating rink, their own tennis court, etc. They live totally outside of the concrete conditions of everyday life. All this explains why the young Franciscan seminarians are often spoiled children who only reach a late maturity. All this explains a ghetto spirit which develops inside this milieu, i.e. a particular way of seeing problems, a judging events, of seeing people and of reacting to diverse situations. In other words, they necessarily develop a mentality and language of a caste. How can we expect young priests who come forth from such a milieu to be able to enter in dialogue, in true dialogue with men—to understand and to be understood by them. There is a wall of incomprehension between them. The young priests often give the impression that they are from another world, rather than men of this world.

The Council exhorts us to do all in our power to develop an

attitude of dialogue in the seminarians: "In general," says the Council, "there should be developed in seminarians the abilities most appropriate for the proportion of dialogue with men, such as a capacity to listen to other people and to open their hearts in a spirit of charity to the various circumstances of human need."[10] This cannot be achieved in any formal course of study. We must create in our house of theology an atmosphere of real dialogue, a milieu concretely open to the world, open not only through the papers and television, but favorable to good contacts with men and women, boys and girls of different social levels, of different religions or sects and of different conceptions of life. This can in part be brought about by a refitting of the actual frames of our scholasticates. But, in my opinion, we must strive to create for our students in theology much more realistic conditions of life, that is conditions of life much closer to the university student in the world. Then we must seek to orient ourselves as much as possible towards creating a new vital structure which will permit our taking root in our present day social setting. This means that we will have to think of leaving our immense scholasticates and of creating small fraternities of students sharing as much as possible the existential condition of men today, especially the poor. In these conditions, our Franciscan students will have the opportunity right in the period of formation of understanding from within the situation of men and to enter into dialogue with them. Only a milieu of life in true dialogue with men can really be appropriate to a complete pastoral formation.

In conclusion let us say that the future, as we see it, will force us to change radically our clerical formation so that it will no longer fall short of this pastoral purpose. We will have to bridge the gap between the situation of the Church and the evolutionary pace of the world. For this, we will have totally to revise the clerical formation. The world is hurling a challenge; to succeed in taking up this challenge we will need much courage and lucidity, much detachment and creativity.

NOTES

[1] *Documents*, p. 442.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 454.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 442.
[4] *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, Documents*, p. 544.
[5] *Ibid.*, 545.
[6] Unfortunately the author fails to cite the reference.
[7] The author fails to give his reference.
[8] *Decree on Priestly Formation, Documents*, p. 455.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 448.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 455.

REORGANIZATION OF THE THEOLOGY CURRICULUM

SABBAS KILIAN, O.F.M.

The *Decree on Priestly Formation* has made it unmistakably clear that "the wished-for renewal of the whole Church depends in large measure on a ministry of priests which is vitalized by the spirit of Christ."[1] The intellectual formation of the seminarian is an essential part of this revitalization process, and this fact must give a tremendous impetus to the enquiry into the theology curriculum.

It is common knowledge by now that the priest of tomorrow must not only be deeply aware of the new insights of Vatican II, of the better understood mission of the Church in the modern world; he must also be deeply concerned about the social and economic revolution of the present age and about the human and cultural outcome of such a revolution. Consequently, "his training must be at once doctrinal and pastoral. The theology he is taught will be an organic reflection of the Church both in its mission and nature and in the impact it must exercise in the world at this moment of history."[2]

In studying the theology curriculum this paper is structured according to the present needs and the very nature of the the problem. Since most of the published material on the question of the curriculum can be regarded as responding to the recommendations of the *Decree on Priestly Formation*, it seems preferable—instead of studying the latter—to turn directly to the latest efforts proposed for solving the problem of the curriculum; in this way I will be in a better position to outline my own suggestions, always bearing in mind the theology curriculum of Franciscan seminaries.

I. LATEST EFFORTS WITH REGARD TO THE THEOLOGY CURRICULUM

From the fast growing literature on seminaries[3] I would like to

analyse three presentations especially connected with the intellectual formation of the seminarian and particular constructive in their approach to the problem of the curriculum: (1) the ideas of John Auricchio, set forth in a series of five articles published in *Pastoral Life*,[4] (2) the "Rockhurst Report" of the American and Canadian Jesuit theologates,[5] and (3) Karl Rahner's pertinent ideas.[6]

Methodology, however, dictates an uneven treatment of these three efforts on account of the common elements—mostly critical in nature concerning the present and past systems of seminary education—found in each of them. To avoid superfluous repetitions it seems advisable and even necessary to give a full treatment of the first scheme, while focusing attention only on the new or unusual elements of the second and third.

1. *The Ideas of John Auricchio*[7]

Theology as a Science

Some regard theology—the science of revealed truths—primarily as a speculative science (Thomists); others, as a practical one (Augustinians). The more traditional view however, holds that it is *both* and to the same extent.

Since it is a science, theology must employ scientific methods of investigation and reasoning. Yet theology is a science *utterly* unlike any oher science: "it deals with doctrine which, besides being a fact, is also a Person." Hence, "the reasoning has to be carried [on] in a prayerful manner. . . . Adaptation to the object of investigations is one of the prime conditions of scientific work. When a sacred object is investigated, therefore, the research must be conducted in a reverential spirit if it is to be scientific" (E. Mersch, S.J.).

The theologian must value the rational work *only* as a means, and maintain vital contact with the divine realities he is treating. Otherwise, his theology will become primarily a *subtle metaphysics* applied to revolution.

The Kerygmatic Function of Theology

Theology also has a kerygmatic function—to prepare and in-

struct priests for the ministry—which is just as important as that of formulating the *objective* truth of revelation. For the primary (and indeed the *only*) end of revelation is the communication of divine life of men. Since men receive this life through faith, theology must adapt itself to the nature and needs of faith.

First of all, faith is an intellectual adhesion to the acceptance of the message and Person of Jesus Christ, the divine Messenger. It has a definite *dogmatic* content and character, with a proper and positive intellectual value. But it is much more. It is a comprehension of God by a loving adhesion, by a sympathetic assent of one's whole being.

The act of faith is also *free* and above all a supernatural *gift* of God. The intervention of the will is absolutely necessary for the making of the act of faith and it depends on determinate spiritual conditions—humility, sincerity, desire for truth, readiness for sacrifice. Theological studies must thus endeavor to develop the seeds of Christian hope and love equally inherent in faith. Living and loving faith is the principle, the foundation and the fruit of theology.[3]

Pastoral Training

Outstanding theologians believe that grave defects in the current theological training of seminarians prevent priests from obtaining a truly pastoral orientation and achieving a really fruitful ministry. Two of the causes can be readily pinpointed. First, the *content* of most current texts is not even authentic scholasticism but only threadbare and uninspiring summaries of the teaching of the great scholastics, lacking originality and unmindful of the personal problems of the student and of modern problems. Secondly, theological studies are usually conducted in an excessively theoretical or abstract *manner*. They must be more practical and concrete for the Church intends to form pastors of souls, not specialists in dialectical argumentation.

Sense of Unity and Synthesis

An exaggerated *separation* of one sacred subject from another has resulted in the student's loss of the sense of *unity* and synthesis existing between the various subjects. The student thus sepa-

rates in his mind—and often inadvertently in his life—dogmatic theology from moral theology, both from sacred Scripture, and all three from his spiritual life. Dogma is reduced to pure theory, moral to ethics lacking the proper supernatural motivation.[9]

Moral theology becomes little more than *causistry,* the science of the *licit* and the *illicit,* an exclusively negative morality as to how far one may go before sinning. Ascetic theology is often neglected since it is regarded as treating of the practice of virtues and "counsels" classified as not obligatory. Mystical theology is looked upon as too lofty and highly dangerous, and hence seldom studied.

Qualities of Modern Theology

To develop faith in the students theology will have to become *personal, concrete, historical,* and *synthetic;* it must draw its inspiration from Scripture, from the Fathers of the Church, from the liturgy and from the testimony of our great saints.

A more *personal approach* is needed because faith is primarily adherence to a Person who has called us into communion with Himself; and Christian morality is a free and loving response to God's invitation of divine friendship.

A more *concrete approach* is required, because the words of God have to be treated in a way that makes them fully relevant and applicable to the *actual* Christian living of the seminarians and the faithful to whom they minister.

An *historical approach* is necessary because God reveals Himself and works His plans for our salvation in the course of human history. Then the persent actuality of His message will stand out, for each of us is playing a particular role in the history of salvation.

Since "the activity of the theologian is an effort to penetrate the meaning and content of Sacred Scripture" (Y. Congar, O.P.), the study of the Word of God itself, that is *biblical theology,* must hold first place among ecclesiastical studies. The many excellent critico-historical studies on the Biblie will be synthesized and incorporated with studies of a more doctrinal scope, in order to understand more fully the wondrous message God addresses to us in Scripture.

Extensive use of the theology of the Fathers will also be made. These witnesses of Christianity lived in a pagan world, and their efforts aimed at converting the richly human Greco-Roman world to the "folly" of the Cross will find deep and surprising echoes in modern man. They have an exceptional sense of *synthesis,* perception of the historical character of the divine plan, and a rich manner of presenting the divine message.[10]

Another fruitful source from which theology must draw understanding and life is the liturgy, "the contemplation through the veil of symbols, of the living God who reveals Himself through His wondrous works in nature and history" (J. Danielou). The priest will thus appreciate fully the mysterious significance of the liturgy in which "the Mystery of Christ, which is the center of the Christian message, unceasingly unfolds, renews and actualizes itself" (L. Bouyer). Herein, "the living faith of the Christian people is expressed in an existential form in which, furthermore, the biblical element holds a place of the first order."

Finally, theology must put an end to the "divorce" that has existed for several centuries between speculative theology and the experiential knowledge of our great spiritual masters and saints, of our "mystics." It must be *synthetic.*

Theological Synthesis

A kerygmatic approach to theology will aid the seminarian to attain a vital *synthesis* of the divine message, to understand the unfolding of God's plan for our salvation—the history of salvation devised by the resources of divine love. The mystery of this redeeming love is the core of the divine message and the essential object of Christian theology.

In the liturgy the Church calls this *admirabile commercium*: "O admirable exchange, the Creator of man, taking upon Himself a human body and soul, has deigned to be born of a Virgin, and appearing here in the world as man has made us partakers of His divinity." This astonishing exchange is the message of the New Testament.[11]

A world which asserts its *human dignity* will give way only to the assertion of the higher dignity of the Christian which such an approach will render more understandable. The Fathers con-

stantly repeat this theme—of our adoption as children of God through the Word Incarnate and of our divinization.[12]

Finally, theology more aware of its kerygmatic function will be *Christocentric,* namely, it will group and synthesize all the truth it studies around the human-divine figure of Our Lord, the "mystery of Christ." The New Testament message is summed up in Jesus Christ: the primitive Church announced primarily the story of the Son of God *made man, dead and risen for us.* This is summarized by the word Gospel: "Go into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature."[13]

Commentary on the Decree on Priestly Formation

Chapter V of the *Decree on Priestly Formation* lists the major traits of a renovated theology, long advocated by theologians interested in up-dating theology: a better *integration* (or unity) of the various studies or disciplines of philosophy and the various branches of theology (Nos. 13 and 14); *pastoral* end of all studies and attainment of a personal *understanding* and concrete translation of the *mystery of Christ* (no. 14); the updating of the study of philosophy, which should impart to the students a "coherent *understanding of man*" and *prepare them for dialogue with men of their time* (No. 15); biblical orientation of theology (Scripture as "the soul of all theology") (No. 16); the use of a *historical approach* or *method* (No. 16).

This will enable the student to approach the study of the development and enrichment of theology and dogma, occasioned by the challenges of the Reformation, modern philosophy, the scientific revolution and modern civilization.

"Other theological disciplines should also be renewed by livelier contact with the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation" (No. 16): moral theology will become grounded on love and bring fruits of love and service for the life of the world; canon law and Church history will become aware of the Church as a human-divine reality of persons and not only as a hierarchical-juridical body with numerous laws, duties and obligations. Other religions will be fairly studied in a spirit of respect, ecumenical understanding and reciprocal sharing of truth. Finally, a living liturgy will complete the great theological synthesis which Vatican

II summons theologians to construct and communicate to future priests.

A Renewed Seminary Curriculum Based on Historical Method

The author points out that his plan—based on the historical method—is not entirely original; neither should it be looked upon as anything more than a flexible framework to serve for a better thought-out and integrated curriculum and for possible experimental "pilot projects."

It attempts to correlate all subjects with the study of *sacred Scripture* and the *history of the Church;* in the *first year,* with the Old Testament; in the *second,* with the New Testament; in the *third,* with the history of the Church to 1054; in the *fourth,* with the Medieval Church to 1517; in the *fifth,* with the Modern Church to the French Revolution; in the *sixth,* with the Church to the present day. It also concentrates on more *positive subjects* at the beginning as recommended by the Catholic scholars who met at the *2nd Christopher Study Week,* July, 1964.[14]

Introductory Course

An introductory course (recommended by Vatican II) will be given in the first year, outlining the mystery of salvation (the *mystery of Christ*) as it has been revealed and realized in history. It will show the relationship of all ecclesiastical studies to the understanding of this divine mystery, for dynamic Christian living and fruitful ministry.

The Study of the Bible

The first two years will be devoted to sacred Scripture: critical, historical, exegetical work, and to *biblical theology*—which must combine both a historical and theological approach and contain a "common point" to integrate in synthetic unity all biblical realities while giving each its own exact intelligibility. This "common point" is God's love revealed in the free gift of His life and joy to men in Jesus Christ. But much work remains to be done before an ideal biblical theology is achieved!

History of the Church

The study of the *history* of the Church in the last four years of the curriculum should impartially tell what took place through the aid of critical methods of historical research and criticism. At the same time, the *full nature* of the *religious* (divine) institution being examined must be taken into consideration. In accord with R. Aubert's views, it must study (1) *all* the redeemed people of God, not only its leaders; (2) the new knowledge and the new love brought us by Jesus: doctrinal controversies against heresies *as well as the development of dogma,* liturgical schools of spirituality, the mystical life, the rich and multiform works of loving service for the relief of bodily and spiritual ills; (3) the possibility of *error and sin* in the works of the hierarchy and the life of the faithful who are "human" and acknowledment of the sincerity and noble qualities of our "adversaries"; (4) the Church's response to the needs and challenges of various historical situations she has encountered—her *adaptations* of the Christian message of each age.

Philosophy

Philosophical subjects are treated in the framework of the history of philosophy and correlated with the history of the Church and the history of dogma. In the *first year*: logic and *epistemology* (if not in junior college) and beginnings of philosophical thought in Greece and in the East; *third year*: latter Greek (Hellenistic) philosophy correlated with the primitive and patristic Church and patristic theology; *fourth year*: intensive treatment of *scholastic* philosophy in a historical context as the response of great Christian thinkers to the cultural and spiritual needs of thir times; *fifth and sixth years*: modern and contemporary philosophy, especially in its bearing on the development of Christian philosophical tradition (Thomism, Augustinianism, etc.): also, the *philosophy of science* and impact of the scientifice revolution.

History of Dogma

As already mentioned, in the *first and second year* the theology

of the Old and New Testament will be examined; *third year*: of the Fathers; *fourth year*: of the great medieval theologians; *fifth year*: of the theological development occasioned by the Reformation, Jansenism and use of positive theology; *sixth year*: of the 19th and 20th century. Such an approach will show the constant and real growth in the *formulation* and *understanding* of the message entrusted to the Church.

Dogmatic Theology

Fundamental theology or apologetics will be treated in the *first year* and special dogmatic theology in the *fifth* and *sixth* year. Apologetics must be *objective*, of course; but also *subjective* to meet both the realities of a *scientific* and *humanistic* age as well as the very requirements of the purpose of revelation which is for the salvation of *man*. It will intelligently utilize (1) the so-called "reasons of the heart," (2) the insights of Blondel and Teilhard de Chardin, and (3) the findings of the psychology and phenomenology of religion.

Only two years are allotted to *special dogmatic theology* because much of the historical foundations and controversial matter which usually introduce the various topical treatises will have been taken care of in the history of dogma and the Church; also, numerous ancient problems and disputes and rational explanations can be left to specialists. A rational elucidation of the main doctrines should be the aim. This should be concerned with both essences and existence, always keeping in mind the *anthropological* purpose of revelation, and integrating some of its topics with moral theology.

Moral Theology

The *first year* will treat the basic "natural" principles of morality, the psychological, sociological and existential *facticity* of man; *second year*: moral principles of the New Testament—a moral of love, grace, total commitment; *third and fourth years*: moral as lived in *fellowship with God; fifth and sixth years*: moral as expressed in *love for our fellow man.*

A renovated moral theology will be based on the *primacy* of love or charity *(agape)*—which is traditional teaching and the

basic principle of St. Thomas' moral theology. In opposition to the "morality of control" of the last 300 years, we must substitute a "moral of responsibility of grace, and of spontaneity," "a moral of the people of God," a social morality lived in the context of the history of salvation. It will concentrate on the paschal mystery and be primarily Christ's law of love.

Liturgy and Catechetics

Liturgy will be taught over the course of four years and correlated with the other disciplines wherein its "theological, historical, ascetical, pastoral and juridical aspects" will be treated in accord with the words of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.*[15]

Homiletics or *Catechesis* also needs thorough revision. The *first year* includes *public speaking* (if needed); and the *theology of preaching* dealing with the specific nature of preaching (pre-evangelization, kerygmatic preaching, catechesis and liturgy sermon as well as homily).

The *history of preaching* correlated with the history of the Church and dogma is laid out as follows: *first year*: Old Testament preaching (emphasizing the prophetic message of social justice and its basis in covenant theology); *second year*: New Testament preaching (especially the parables); *third year*: patristic preaching (patterns of liturgical initiation); *fourth year*: medieval preaching (use and necessity of evangelical preachers); *fifth year*: Reformation and post-Reformation preaching (emphasis on the liturgy of the Word and dynamic traditions of Protestant preaching); *sixth year*: modern preaching (modern liturgical, biblical, and catechetical movements).

Finally, there should be a good basic knowledge of the principles of sociology and psychology as well as a good course in the *techniques* of modern communication.

Diverse Other Subjects

Psychology and Phenomenology of Religion (first year); this will include a study of the primitive religions and the main non-Christian religions. A two year (minimum) course in *Pastoral Psychology* and *Counseling Techniques (fourth and fifth years). Sociology*, in the *sixth year. Latin* (and other languages) should

be attended to in junior colleges. Finally, *Non-Catholic Churches* (*fifth year* or with general history of the Church) and *History of* the Church in the U.S. *(sixth year).*

Textbooks

The author concludes with the hope that a project can be initiated in the future involving some of our best scholars in the various disciplines in writing a series of correlated texts: updated, clear, original and open, to serve as a basis for future study.

The past should not be cast aside but used. Above all, it must be realized that theology may not be the most important thing in the life of the priest, or even the seminarian—but it is the most important thing in the seminary.

2. *The "Rockhurst Report"*

The Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry—IFPU—constituted by the mandate of the Fathers Provincial of the American Assistancy, held its meetings at Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri, November 7-13, 1965. The purpoe of these meetings was to make recommendations for reformation of the theology curriculum. Though the members of IFPI could not reach unanimity on everything, all resolutions were carried by majority vote and were expected to be implemented by the individual Jesuit theologates of the United States and Canada in the academic year of 1966-67. The following is an attempt to summarize the essential features of these resolutions.[16]

Recommendations regarding the Four-Year Theology Program

General Recommendations: (1) Civil degrees such as the B.D. and the Th.M. should replace their ecclesiastical equivalents. (2) Cycle courses should be eliminated, and electives introduced in abundance. (3) Close contact should be established with a full university to insure a proper range of offerings especially at the graduate level.

Recommendations on the Bachelor's level: (1) The baccalaureate degree should be awarded after 72 hours of course work about equally divided among biblical, historical, systematic, and

pastoral studies. (2) Comprehensive examinations based on the four areas will qualify students for specialized areas of study to be undertaken in the fourth year of theology toward an academic or professional degree. (3) Great emphasis should be placed on liturgy, and a special liturgy course taught by a trained liturgist. (4) Supervised practice in various forms of ministry should be provided. (5) Not all the matter to be included in either comprehensive or course examinations need be presented in lectures, seminars, or other types of formal instruction.

Recommendations on the Graduate Level: Graduate study would be of two types: (1) toward an *academic* master's in theology; (2) leading toward a *professional* master's in theology. The first would include seminars gearing toward Ph.D. study. The second would involve course and seminars directed toward the more immediate application of theology to the various ministries, e.g., parish work. In either case thirty credits beyond the bachelor's would be required (for the academic Master's this might include a thesis). These credits could be taken at another institution, even at a non-Catholic university.

Recommendations regarding Pre-Theologate Theology

General Recommendations: (1) Although a uniform program of theology should be adopted throughout all the provinces, faculties of the respective theologates would have a decisive voice in determining the precise content of the curriculum. (2) All courses should be taught by academically competent theologians; novitiate courses should be academic and for credit.

Proposed Curriculum: The following proposed curriculum should result in at least the equivalent of a respectable undergraduate major in sacred studies: (1) *Novitiate*: 12 hours to be spent on the various New Testament books; 3 hours on ascetical theology in the second year of the novitiate. (2) *Juniorate*: 6 credits in Old Testament; 3 in Christology; 3 in liturgy. (3) *Philosophate*: 3 credits in revelation; 3 in Christian life (as in Mersch, *Moral Theology and the Mystical Body*); 3 in the pre-Reformation Church and theology; 3 in the Reformation and the modern Church (the last two courses would be historico-systematically considered).

3. *Karl Rahner's Position*

Perhaps no one has contributed more to the present understanding of the problem of the theology curriculum than Karl Rahner. He wrote about it long before Vatican II[17] and he has been forcefully pressing the issue since the Council.[18]

Though the scope of his preoccupation has been the task of the professional theologian and the theology program on the university level, some of his considerations offer invaluable insights into the complex nature of the theology curriculum and challenge the whole present understanding of the method and the problems of theology.

Curriculum

It should be pointed out, first of all, that Rahner has introduced *phenomenology* into *fundamental theology* by recommending the phenomenological study of religion in general as well as the phenomenology of the non-Christian religions, of Christianity, of the Christian heresies, and of Roman Catholic Christianity. Then, in *special dogmatic theology* he has proposed the study of man in two parts. Part one: the study of man (and his world) as a nature with a supernatural finality; and part two: the study of the fall and redemption; including the nature of sin, God and sin, the Redeemer, the Church of Christ, the theological anthropology of the redeemed, and eschatology. These two main parts of special dogmatic theology could perhaps be characterized as *general and Christian anthropologies.* As such, they can open up a completely new understanding of the approach to theology, its purpose and its problems.

Furthermore, Rahner has pointed out the importance of *ecclesiological themes* in the present study of theology. It is his deep conviction that the Council's ecclesiology should be a special concern of theology and the theologians. In his own words:

> . . . the Council formulated its teaching according to tradition, but this does not mean that it did not move many ecclesiological themes into the foreground of theological awareness, themes that deserve and need further reflection and that have very practical consequences. The precise relationship of the primacy to the entire episcopate, the

> nature of the ordinary magisterium, the relationship between Scripture and tradition, the pneumatic-sacramental basis of law in the Church, the role of charisms within the Church, the theology of the diaconate, the Church's eschatological character, the possibility of salvation for the non-Christian, the ecclesiological aspect of penance (and of the sacraments in general), the nature of revelation and salvation history, the synodal principle of the constitution of the Church in general, the ecclesiological place of the evangelical counsels and religious communities in the Church, the meaning and significance of speaking about the hierarchy of truths of revelation, the theology of the missions, the possibility of a *communicatio in sacris* among separated Christians, the function of non-Christian religions in the collective and individual history of salvation, the obligation of the pope (even if juridically it cannot be determined any further) to make use of collegial organs within the Church, the theology of the local community and altar community as Church, the possibility of a historical development of the *jus divinum* in apostolic times, the theology of the word and theological hermeneutics—these and many other ecclesiological (in the broadest sense) themes newly confront theology because of the Council.[19]

New Approach

One can see immediately that in Rahner's mind the theology of the future should not be that of textbooks or the mere parroting of the Council's thematic set. Rather it should be "the thematic of the ultimate foundations of the Christian message on which the etnire hierarchically structured edifice of Catholic dogma rests—the very last, which is at once the ultimate need and the most sublime vocation of man. This is what tomorrow's theology must consider if it wants to be a theology worthy of the Council; it must consider it with a faith ready to be attacked, a faith that always breaks up the clear definition of formulas into the incomprehensibility of God, and thus, while forced into this incomprehensibility, becomes simple and uncomplicated."[20]

It is perhaps on this point that Rahner has rendered the greatest service to contemporary theology and to the intellectual and spiritual formation of today's seminarian. Education is rooted in the past and present, but it is aimed at the future. The same is true of theological education. Consequently, the seminarian must "strive to learn to speak the new language of the future"[21] and

to acquire a Christian theology that is understandable and meaningful for the diaspora Christian of the future.[22] This particular element of the Christian situation weighs heavily on the theologian because it demands creativity and sensitivity in treating theological issues. To quote Rahner once more:

> . . . if someone is making mere statements that are certainly orthodox and must not and cannot arouse the slightest contradiction on the part of the magisterium, then such a person must ask himself whether he is not merely a sterile repeater of statements which, while they may be correct, he himself has not properly understood and cannot express in a way so as to be comprehended by modern man. To be orthodox in such a scholastic way is no work of art, is it? Let us agree that even if Teilhard de Chardin[23] has not in every respect succeeded in doing justice to dogma, then I would say *in magnis voluisse sat est.* That it isn't as bad as when we teachers of theology give forth with a very orthodox but sterile theology that is of interest to no one.[24]

To succeed in educating tomorrow's seminarian the "sterile repeaters" must be replaced by well informed, imaginative, creative and, to some extent, daring theologians.

II. PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Critique of Three Studies*

These three studies are very much different in nature and in approach. Yet each of them is valuable in its own right and deserves serious consideration.

Strong Points

It is evident that J. Auricchio's theological understanding rests on the *kerygmatic approach* and gives primary consideration to the *pastoral aspect* in seminary education. Though K. Rahner acknowledges the immense value of the pastoral outlook, and supports it wholeheartedly, his theological perspective goes deeper, is more intellectual, and *aims primarily at restructuring the overall subject matter of theology* by investigating it from the view-

point of *Christian anthropology.* The "Rockhurst Report" seems to be situated in between these two basic positions and as such it too intends to take care of *both the intellectual and the pastoral* needs and interest of the seminarian.

Yet all three studies converge on one point. They highly recommend, in complete harmony with the Council,[25] a strong *historical approach to theology.* Father Auricchio's propositions in reference to the teaching of Sacred Scripture, the history of the Church, the history of dogma and the history of philosophy, carefully distributed over the whole span of six seminary years, serve this purpose admirably. Neither do the other two studies lack vision and understanding in this regard.[26]

Weak points

However, I cannot embrace any of the three sets of proposals entirely and unreservedly. First, the Auricchio and the Rahner suggestions would make any theology program *extremely crowded and almost unmanageable.* Electives and particular interests would be discouraged if not completely ignored. Then, the entire academic work of the seminarian would be tied to the classroom, to his physical presence at the lectures—*to the detriment of personal initiative and creativity.* Finally, they do not seem to provide in the program for pastoral *activity* and for social apostolate on the part of the student.

More specifically in Auricchio's schema, (1) there is no apparent reason why liturgy should be *limited* to the last four years. For example, Old Testament liturgy could be given in the *first year* and New Testament liturgy in the *second year,* in addition to what the author has sketched out for the other years.

(2) What W. Quanbech found lacking in the *Decree on Priestly Formation,* is also lacking in this schema—there is no single course on the use of the *library* which is particularly important today.

(3) Another *real lack* is the absence of a first class study of *literature.* This cannot hope to be adequately done in junior college. And as a quotation from Father Francis Tyrell's speech to the NCEA convention in August 1966 so well put it (in the author's only reference to literature), literature is most important to

enable the student to learn the "life and agonies [of the City of Man] at least vicariously." The author does mention *communication media* but these could be emphasized much more today.

(4) It would also be well if a *bona fide* course on *teaching methods* (both formal and informal) were available. For to the ordinary faithful the priest will always be a teacher. And although the author stresses *catechesis, psychology* and *sociology,* there is still room for a real *course* as such.

The "Rockhurst Report," for its part, presents problems of its own. First of all, it has been specifically devised for the theological education of the Jesuit seminarian, and as such its program spreads out over a number of years usually *not available* to the education of the non-Jesuit seminarian. The long years of the novitiate, the juniorate, the philosophate and the theologate give both student and professor an *unparalleled* maneuverability and elasticity in the theology curriculum.

It might also be added that he "Rockhurst Report," it seems to me, would definitely keep *theology separate from philosophy,* though some theology courses would be taught simultaneously with the *philosophy* curriculum. Whether one calls these two branches of learning theology and philosophy or pre-theologate theology and theologate theology, really does not matter. The change in terminology would not necessarily bring about their complete integration.[27]

Synthesis of Best Features

It is therefore avaisable that all the imaginative and constructive features of the three studies be utilized in a further enquiry into the problem of the theology curriculum, evaluated specifically in the perspective of the education of the Franciscan seminarian in the United States and Canada. This viewpoint alone somehow enlarges the scope of the present study and calls not only for a scrutiny into the theology curriculum, but also for the realization of all those prerequisites without which one cannot even hope for a meaningful restructuring of the curriculum itself. What are these prerequisites?[28]

2. *General Requirements for Restructuring Theology*

Curriculum[29]

Based on New Exigencies

It has been stressed lately that as a result of the Council, "almost overnight the priest is challenged to break down the walls of his own little ghetto."[30] Why with such an unprecedented haste? Mostly, because three new dimensions presenting new exigencies to the priest have been clarly recognized as valid: "The horizontal, or the widening of the priest's ministry; the vertical, or the study of man in his depth; and lastly, the transcendental, or the current theological renewal."[31]

Loss of the University

These exigencies, in my opinion, are *outcries* for something the Church lost a long time ago, i.e., university education and university environment. For how true it is "that the greatest sacrifice the Church made through the Reformation was the loss of the university. When one realizes that the piece for which she traded the university was the seminary the sacrifice appears only the greater."[32]

It is this loss that should be primarily blamed for the deplorable dichotomy found between the priest and the community he is called to serve. While the latter is a par of a fastmoving world, made up of an evergrowing number of college- and university-trained individuals, the former represents an archaic seminary system of the post-Tridentine times closely identified with a highly autocratic mentality. "Those were the days of kings who possessed so-called 'divine rights,' of paternalistically governed states, of dictatorships with total thought control—of a society still largely immature."[33]

Jansenistic Distrust of Human Nature

Add to this the Jansenistic distrust of human nature: "It first crept into our monastic life and eventually into our seminaries. And with a hot iron it was branded into our superior-subject relationships, into our 'infallible' policy of no contact, no dialogue. The repercussions were that only the Church-governed

society was the *good society,* the Kingdom of God, so to say, while the world of politics, economics and progress—the secular world—was the bad society, the Kingdom of Satan that had to be converted—but not met on its terms!"[34]

The consequence is, then, self-evident. The seminarian "should be allowed the normal contemporary channels of education open to all young people of his age,"[35] and his theology curriculum should reflect the intellectual standard of his contemporaries.

On the basis of this I would like to offer the following suggestions for consideration.

Intellectual Capacity as Condition for Vocation

1) The Council's recommendation that "in all selection and testing of seminarians necessary standards must always be firmly maintained"[36] should be taken very seriously and interpreted as requiring an intellectual capacity generally advocated for admittance to college and university. Not even in the case of "a regrettable shortage of priests"[37] should one disregard this preliminary condition of the priestly vocation.

Regional Seminaries Only

2) The time has come, it seems to me, to call a halt to the provincial seminaries and to transform them into regional ones so located geographically that they could become integral parts of and operate in prominent Catholic or secular universities. If we are not willing to make this move as an initial step toward total reorganization of the seminaries, any hope for a satisfactory solution of the problem would rest on merely superficial changes. For it is generally understood that

> an analysis of Catholic seminaries as *academic* institutions, whatever else they may be, is a marked characteristic of contemporary seminary criticism. It is also one of the areas in which a consensus seems to be emerging: at least an agreement that there must be a severe academic reappraisal of the seminaries and a much more affirmative attitude toward the university world.[38]

Only a regional seminary, affiliated with a first-rate university,

could stand the pressure of today's competition for a fully qualified faculty, for an adequate library, for creative freedom, and for a stimulating academic atmosphere.

Civil Degrees Granted

3) It is also desirable, and even necessary, in the present circumstances that the seminarian be accorded civil degrees in theological studies: the B.D. (Bachelor of Divinity) at the end of his bachelor's program and the Th.M. (Master of Theology), or the M.R.E. (Master in Religious Education), at the end of the master's program. The Th.M. should be an *academic* degree and the M.R.E. a *professional* degree. Accordingly, the first four years of the seminary education should be devoted to the bachelor's program, and the last two years to the master's program.

Elimination of "Inbreeding"

4) The regional house of studies should be under the control of the faculty. "The principle of academic collegiality should be operative. Bishop [Fathers Provincial] and rector *and* faculty, but with the faculty as *primus inter pares*."[39] Furthermore, the faculty must comprise both clergy and laity selected and promoted on competitive basis, granting tenure, and sabbatical leaves, offering incentives, recognizing publishing obligations, and furthering postgraduate education, research and publication, etc. "Inbreeding" should be banned from seminaries for good.

Change in Teaching Method

5) It is customary today to accuse the seminarian of being self-centered, of lacking in trust and responsibility, of having developed a sense of clerical possessiveness, and of having set an eye on future promotions.[40] If this is so, a change even in the teaching method should be considered mandatory.

The *Decree on Priestly Formation* is especially helpful on this point in two directions. First, it stresses the *oneness* of the seminary family. Professors and students "should constitute the kind of family which answers the Lord's prayer 'that they may be one' (cf. Jn. 17:11) and which intensifies in each student the

joy of his calling." Professors and directors "need to be keenly aware of how greatly the outcome of seminary formation depends on their own manner of thinking and acting." Therefore, "they should create the strictest harmony in spirit and behavior."[41]

Then, they should also realize that studying theology is not a problem primarily of memorizing and mechanical remembering, but of vision and understanding. These qualities of the mind should be developed by the careful application of both the *historical* and the *systematic* approach in dogmatic theology. While the former enables the student to embrace the consciousness of history by becoming aware of each step of dogmatic development, the latter sets him in contemporary context and raises the vitally important thematic questions of the burning present. In a theoretical, speculative way it assumes the responsibility of bringing about a personally integrated and communicable understanding of the faith.[42]

To be, however, integrated and communicable, the understanding of the faith does not originate in the teacher's work alone; it must be the result of a *cooperative effort* of student and professor. For this reason, besides lecturing, other possible means and methods, more challenging for the student, should also be tried and explored. In the words of the *Decree,*

> Since doctrinal training ought not to aim at a mere communication of ideas, but at a genuine and deep formation of students, teaching methods should be revised as they apply to lectures, discussions, and seminars and with respect to the promotion of study among students, whether individually or in small groups.[43]

"Cooperative effort"—this term indicates a new trend and a new challenge in seminary education. More challenge perhaps for the teacher than for the student—yet a challenge no one can take lightly. Seminars, discussion classes, study groups, term papers, etc. could perform creative functions in the developing mind of the young theologian and stimulate him to carry on a meaningful dialogue with his teacher. The skeptical, the tired, and the disillusioned who would not even try to go beyond the false conviction that "talking is teaching and listening is learning" should realize that his usefulness in educating the possible

leaders of tomorrow has ended. For "when we grow weary of seeking, it will be time for younger and more enterprising men to take our place."[44]

Group-Teaching

6) Finally, I should indicate another methodological need that, to my knowledge, has so far gone unanswered. I am referring to *group-teaching*—particularly, in regard to the development of dogma. If the danger "of treating theology as though it were only a body of knowledge or a collection of techniques"[45] is real and threatening the personal faith of the seminarian, it is imperative that he be offered a *first-hand enquiry* into the pulsing life of the Church and into the life-generating processes of the interconnected Christian mysteries. No one man can do such a taxing job today!

It should be the *cooperative task* of the dogmatic theologian (most of all, the ecclesiologist), the liturgist, the moral theologian and/or canonist. Together, by being present at the lecures or discussion classes all the time, they could bring about a valuable understanding of the human and supernatural elements in the Church, of the mutual enrichment of doctrine and liturgy, of historical human needs and their fulfillments and/or failures. In this way, the seminarian would become conscious of the vital role of theology in the life of the Church and would be enabled to search for solution of human problems in the light of revelation and history.

This group-handling of the development of dogma would also limit the study to the substantial aspects of the development and entitle the systematic theologian to devote his attention entirely to the *problems of today*.[46]

3. *Theology Curriculum*

In view of what has been said so far, I can now try to outline the theology curriculum as a proposal for the education of today's Franciscan seminarian.

Baccalaureate Program

1) The first four years will make up the baccalaureate of his

program at the end of which[47] he will take the bachelor's comprehensives. His course work should be approximately evenly distributed in the following major areas: Scripture, historical studies (Church history, history of dogma, ecumenical studies, study of religion), systematic theology, and theologico-pastoral studies. If and where there is great demand for philosophy, arrangement should be made accordingly. Course work and comprehensives would normally require 72 credit hours.

2) It seems advisable that not only philosophy but, in a certain measure, even the *novitiate* be incorporated in the total view of theology planning—especially, from the view point of proper perspective. If it is desirable, it must be provided at the very start of priestly and religious formation. I recommend therefore that the following courses be given in the novitiate, with all the requirements of full-fledged academically recognized credit-courses:

a) A study of the *primacy of Christ* in salvation history; His role in creation and recreation; the mission of the Christian today.[48] I am convinced that this deeply Franciscan theme so closely associated with the history of the Order would give the most appropriate orientation to the young candidate for the priesthood.

b) An elementary course in *fundamental theology* for the study of the possibility of revelation, of revelation in space and time, and of theology.

c) An introductory course on the physiognomy of the *contemporary man,* his aspirations and difficulties, his hopes and discouragements, his beliefs and his moral ideals.

d) Finally, a basic course on Christian symbolism, on the formation of the *Christian liturgy* in a New Testament and in the patristic era, would contribute greatly to the initiation of the young candidate to the promising field of theology.[49]

Theology Proper

1) In the *first year* of the curriculum the student will be offered the following courses:

a) *Philosophy*: logic and epistemology.

b) *Sacred Scripture*: critical introduction to the Old Testament and its books; salvation history in the Old Testament; the principles of exegesis.

c) *History of dogma*: the phenomenology of religion in general; non-Christian religions; Christian heresies.

d) *Systematic theology*: the problem of God; contemporary atheism and Christiam unbelief.

e) *Biblical languages*: according to the particular needs.

f) *Research*: introduction to research, tools of research, the use of library, periodicals, dictionaries, etc.

2) The course of the *second year* will be as follows:

a) *Philosophy*: history of Oriental, Greek, and Hellenistic philosophy.

b) *Sacred Scripture*: critical introduction to the New Testament and its books; salvation history in the New Testament; principle themes.

c) *History of the Church*: the primitive and patristic Church, its life, its institutions and laws.

d) *History of dogma*: doctrinal development in the New Testament and in the Fathers.

e) *Systematic theology*: Christ and the redemption.

f) *Moral theology and canon law*: New Testament and patristic moral ideals.

3) The *third year* of the curriculum will be based on the following courses:

a) *Philosophy*: history of medieval and modern philosophy.

b) *Sacred Scripture*: selected themes or books for exegesis.

c) *History of the Church*: the medieval era and the Reformation.

d) *History of dogma*: the great medieval ssystems and post-Tridentine theology.

e) *Systematic theology*: the Church, its trinitarian relations, its sacramental and institutional life; the Church as a eucharistic community.

f) *Moral theology and canon law*: theological anthropology; participation in the life of God.

4) The *fourth year* of the program will include the *19th and the 20th centuries* for the history of philosophy, the history of the Church, and the history of dogma; systematic theology will explore *eschatology* and *ecumenical theology* while liturgy will study the *liturgical dimensions of the mystery of salvation* and the

liturgical movement. A special course will also be offered in contemporary literature concerning the *role attributed to God* in modern novel and drama.[50]

Graduate Proper

This section of the program is based on the assumption that the student will have decided by this time about his own further interest in theology. If he intends to study for the Ph.D. in theology, he must adopt the program of the *academic* degree. If, on the other hand, he intends to work in the different ministries, he subscribes to the *professional* degree.

In either case, he has to carry 15 credit hours in his major[51] and 6 credit hours in his minor.[52] The major and minor field should be outlined according to local needs, possibilities, etc. The remaining credit hours must be from the courses offered in the professional program.

Without going into detail, I would like to suggest the following as typical courses in the graduate program:

a) *Philosophy*: contemporary systems of philosophy; philosophy of science; study of important individual philosophers, Marxism, God in contemporary philosophy, ethical theories, sociology, etc.

b) *Sacred Scripture*: hermeneutics; contemporary Protestant and Catholic biblical studies; biblical theology; the covenant theme as a basic concept of both Testaments, etc.

c) *Systematic theology*: the problem of mariology, Scripture and tradition, the theology of sin, primacy and collegiality, the theology of death, the theology of history, liturgy and sacramental life, etc.

d) *Pastoral theology*: the diaspora Church, the theology of the laity, the Church in the modern world, the theology of marriage, liturgical piety, the theory of preaching, teaching methods, the sociology of religion, psychoanalysis, the art of counseling, etc.

4. *Possible Objections*

Tedious Nature of Historical Approach

I am very much aware of some of the disadvantages that can

result from this program. One of them is the *seemingly tedious nature* of the threefold study of history in philosophy, in the development of dogma, and in the history of the Church. Yet this very same thing could be turned into a tremendous asset by the professors' genius and by the fact that *not all the courses* necessarily signify lectures and compulsory attendance. In fact, no student should be allowed to carry more than 15, preferably 12, credit hours a semester. Otherwise, the creative approach to the whole program would be stifled as its very start.

Limited Time Allotted to Systematic Theology

The second trouble-spot is concerned with *systematic theology,* and with the *limited time* accorded to its study. I believe, however, that systematic theology's primary, if not sole, purpose is to ask the questions of today and to investigate them in the light of contemporary developments and needs. Instead of repeating the findings of the study of the development of dogma, professors should use the charism of discernment and pay due attenion to the relevance of their thematic selections and to the expectations of their students.

Degree-Oriented Structure

Finally, I should mention the principal objection to the entire program: its degree-oriented structure. I am ready to admit that this is a rather unusual proposition for the seminary of an Order basically pastoral and active in character. The unusual, however, is not necessarily impossible or useless. On the contrary, unusual times call for unusual measures and approaches. And I feel that in the present dire need and pressing circumstances the complete restructuring of the theology curriculum requires the creative, responsible atmosphere of the university, its teaching method and research, its freedom of enquiry and its degree structure.[53]

The Order, by accepting responsibility for those who wish to devote themselves to its ideals and objectives, owes this quality education to its members and to the world it wants to serve. In this regard, we have to return to the Middle Ages again and learn from our forefathers how to utilize the values of the university

world for man and for theology, and how to embrace it wholeheartedly in planning the theology curriculum.

5. *Franciscan Vision*

May I also add that this pressing duty should be particularly challenging to the Franciscan Order—especially on two grounds.

Theological View of Man and the World

First, theologically, the Franciscan view of man and his world, the notion of creation and the "natural sacredness" of the "shadow," the "vestige" and the "image" preserved in creatures,[54] the primacy of Christ in creation and in the history of mankind,[55] the central role of the humanity of Christ in the history of salvation,[56] and the primacy of love[57] are so many interesting and attractive features to provide a *unified vision* and the proper perspective for the whole theological enterprise.

But they are more than that. They are *openings* to the man of today. They are peep-holes enabling him to marvel at the closeness of the supernatural, at the concreteness of the divine, and at the attractiveness of the redemptive process. This the Franciscan Order must treasure, preserve, develop, and make available to those who search for the meaningfulness of Christianity in the modern world. It must do so because these theological issues identify its heritage with the very interest of today's man.

Correct Notion of Secularity

I believe, secondly, that the Franciscan educator should never fear the concept of "secularity" rightly understood and properly handled. "Secularity" belongs to the *very being* of the Order. As Christopher Dawson succinctly put it,

> . . . the Franciscan attitude to nature and human life marks a turning point in the religious history of the West. It is the end of the long period during which human nature and the present world had been dwarfed and immobilized by the shadow of eternity, and the beginning of a new epoch of humanism and interest in nature. As Karl Burdach has shown, its importance is not limited to the religious field, but it has a wider significance for the whole development of

> European culture. Its influence is to be seen both in the new art of 13th and 14th century Italy, which already contains the germs of the Renaissance, and in the social movements of the 14th century, in which for the first time the poorest and most oppressed elements of mediaeval society asserted their claims to justice.[58]

The fact that Christopher Dawson was supposedly the first person to emphasize the "secularism" of Franciscan thought[59] only adds to the value of his statement. There is, however, another element present in his vision which deserves particular attention. He insists that "it is in the region of thought that the new realization of the reality and value of humanity and the whole order of nature had the most important results. The intellectual synthesis of the 13th century has often been regarded as the triumph of theological dogmatism. It was in reality the assertion of the rights of the human reason and the foundation of European science."[60]

Franciscan thought was certainly not the only important feature in the process of secularization of medieval culture. But it was a very substantial one. So much so that J. M. Cameron singles it out, together with Aristotelianism, as *especially significant* in influencing medieval thought and its development.[61] They "can be treated as two aspects of a single process, the appearance in a new form of ancient themes, fundamentally Biblical. . . . In both the reality of sensible objects is affirmed. . . . Both are empiricist, seeking God in and through creatures. . . ."[62] Then he adds specifically,

> . . . Franciscan spirituality celebrates in a perfectly naturalistic way the material world. This celebration is in the vernacular, not in Latin, the language of learned men and clerks, and it is a celebration of the simplicity and beauty and, so to speak, companionship of God's creatures: sun, moon, wind, cloud, fire, earth, fruit, and flowers. This is one of the great moments in human history; for the nature celebrated in Francis' "Canticle of the Creatures" is nature freed from the demonic, cleansed of its occult and fearful powers, fresh from the hand of God.[63]

Similar to Modern Secularism

This "vast process of secularization"[64] of the medieval culture,

brought about by both the reception of Aristotle and Franciscan spirituality, looks *strikingly similar* to the movement toward secularity advocated by the man of today. It is true that there is a tremendous *difference*: instead of the homogeneous nature of medieval culture, we live in a pluralistic society; but this only stresses the need for a better understanding of man in our own contemporary society. The process cannot be denied or ignored. But it can be guided and helped. It can be made more meaningful by embracing it as a natural vehicle for Christian values.

Following in the footsteps of the Middle Ages, a new anthropological approach to theology, a deeper understanding of the humanity and primacy of Christ, an unparalleled appreciation of the centrality of love, the positive acceptance of pluralism, and, negatively, the elimination of any kind of pseudo-theocracy[65] and the misplaced hope of a recreated homogeneous society of Christian culture, would certainly bring about a *better understanding of* and a *new method of expressing* Christianity in our pluralistic society. For pluralism is here to stay. Theology had better take this fact into consideration, and make its message relevant for the Christian living in this society.

This can be *properly done only in the university environment.* It is our duty to recognize this now and to reorganize the whole theology curriculum accordingly. The *example* of our forefathers and the tremendous *responsibility* to the students and society do not give us any alternative.

NOTES

[1] *Documents,* p. 437. Cf. also Warren A. Quanbeck, "A Response," *ibid.,* p. 458.

[2] Alexander Carter, "Priestly Formation," *ibid.,* p. 436; cf. also James Keller and Richard Armstrong (ed.), *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary in the Light of Vatican II* (New York: The Christophers, 1965) p. 5.

[3] See, for example, Walter D. Wagoner, *The Seminary Protestant and Catholic* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966); James Keller and Richard Armstrong (ed.), *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary in the Light of Vatican Council II* (New York: The Christophers, 1965); Stafford Poole, *Seminary in Crisis* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965); H. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel D. Williams, and James M. Gustafson (ed.), *The Advancement of Theological Education* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957); James M. Lee and Louis J. Putz, *Education in a Time of Change* (Notre Damee: Fides Publishers, 1965); Yorke Allen, Jr., *A Seminary Survey* (New York: Har-

per & Row, 1960); William K. Leahy and Anthony T. Massimini (ed.), *Third Session Council Speaches of Vatican II* (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1966); Stanley I. Stuber and Claud D. Nelson, *Implementing Vatican II in Your Community* (New York: Guild Press, 1967); "The International Congress of Education for the Priesthood in Western Europe," *The Church and the Liturgy. Concilium,* vol. 2 (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965), pp. 186-191; John L. Murphy, "The Seminary College Course," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* vol. CLV (October, 1966), pp. 242-257; Kevin Condon, "Seminary Reform: Educating in Theology," *Doctrine and Life,* vol. 17 (February, 1967), pp. 70-81; "Reform des Theologiestudiums aus der Sicht des Professors," *Theologie und Glaube,* vol. 56 (1966), pp. 24-35; M. Longard, W. Göddeke, E. Drewermann, "Rückblick auf das Theologiestudium aus der Perspektive eines Seminarsten," *Theologie und Glaube, op. cit.,* pp. 48-53; A. von Raab-Straube, "Vergleichende Bemerkungen zur Reform des Theologiestudiums," *Theologie und Glaube, loc. cit.,* pp. 57-62; Hermann Schalück, "Die Reform des theologischen Studiums aus der Sicht der Orden," *Theologie und Glaube, loc. cit.,* pp. 62-67; Bruno Rosenwick, "Roform der Theologenausbildung," *Theologie und Glaube, loc. cit.,* pp. 68-81; Walter Gardini, "The Teaching of Theology and the Evangelization of the World," *Christ to the World,* vol. X (1965), pp. 47-57; Waler J. Burghardt, "Today's Seminary for Tomorrow's Priest,' *'The Catholic Mind* (October, 1966), pp. 36-39; for more information, see also James Burns, *Bibliography of Recent Periodicals and Books Dealing with Seminaries: 1960-65* (Baltimore: St. Mary's Seminary).

[4] *Pastoral Life,* vol. XIV (1966), pp. 469-476, 517-522; 581-589, 645-655; vol. XV (1967), pp. 25-42.

[5] "Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry Report," *Woodstock Letters,* vol. 95 (Summer, 1966), pp. 335-356; see also Justin S. Kelly, "Toward a New Theology—the Implications of Rockhurst," *ibid.,* pp. 357-370.

[6] "The Prospects for Dogmatic Theology," *Theological Investigations,* vol. I (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), pp. 1-18; "A Scheme for a Treatise of Dogmatic Theology," *ibid.,* pp. 19-37; "Gedanken zur Ausbildung der Theologen," *Orientierung,* vol. 18 (1954), pp. 149-152; 165-168; "Über die theoretische Ausbildung künftiger Priester heute," *Stimmen der Zeit* (1964/65), pp.173-193; "The Task of Theology after the Council," John H. Miller (ed.), *Vaticcan II: An Interfaith Appraisal* (Notre Dame—London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), pp. 589-598; also the discussion that followed his lecture, *ibid.,* pp. 599-608.

[7] The first article, "Kerygmatic Theology," *Pastoral Life,* vol. XIV (1966), pp. 469-476, was originally written in 1955 and is only a kind of bird's-eye view of the history of kerygmatic theology up to 1954. Much of the material is more than amply covered in the last four articles of his series; therefore I think it can be entirely omitted in our study without doing injustice to the author's idea and their intelligibility.

[8] Unfortunately, the author is not very precise in his bibliographical refer-

ences. He lists the source of this quotation as B. Murchland (ed.), *God Speaks,* p. 15.

[9] The author might well have added to complete the cycle: and Scripture becomes simply a study in linguistic analysis and scientific exegesis.

[10] On this point the author quotes R. Aubert (once again giving an incomplete reference: *Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise,* introduction): "The Fathers have an exceptional sense of synthesis, of the connection of the mysteries in the totality of the divine plan. They have also a vivid perception of the historical character of this plans. . . . Their manner of presenting the divine message is much richer from the religious point of view than is the analytic manner of later theology. . . ."

[11] Cf. 2 Cor. 8:9; 1 John 3:1; 2 Peter 1:3 f.

[12] The author quotes briefly (without indicating references) from Irenaeus, Hilary, and Athanasius.

[13] Matt. 28:19. The author also studies Christ's central role in the salvation of man as it is expounded in the Epistles of St. Paul.

[14] Cf. note 3, above.

[15] Cf. *Decree,* 16; *Documents,* p. 453. For a comprehensive view of Father Auricchio's schema see Appendix I at the end of this study.

[16] One of the great values of the "Rockhurst Report" is that its recommendations cannot be ignored. Resolution 5 says in this regard: "The Theologate Deans should include on the agenda for all regular meetings an exchange of information on how the IFPI recommendations are being implemented in the houses of study of the individual provinces," *Woodstock Letters, loc. cit.,* p. 338. See also "The Training of Scholastics Especially in Studies," *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation* (Woodstock, Md.: Woodstock College, 1967), pp. 28-35.

[17] Cf. note 6, above.

[18] On this point I should single out his Notre Dame paper, "The Task of Theology after the Council," *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal,* pp. 589-598.

[19] *Ibid.,* pp. 593-594.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 595.

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 596.

[22] For the study of the diaspora Church, see K. Rahner's following works: *The Christian Commitment* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); *Nature and Grace. Dilemmas in the Modern Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); *The Christian of the Future* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

[23] The text quoted here is part of the answer given by Rahner to a question in reference to Teilhard de Chardin.

[24] *Vatican II,* p. 603.

[25] "Students should be shown what the Fathers of the Eastern and Western Church contributed to the fruitful transmission and illumination of the individual truths of revelation, and also the later history of dogma and its relationship to the general history of the Church" (*Decree on Priestly Formation,* 16; *Documents,* p. 452).

[26] It is very interesting to note that Rahner, while upholding the historical

method in teaching, makes it quite clear that he does not mean an "unlimited historical curiosity for everything." On the contrary, "historical theology should not merely ask what has been, but it must investigate the past in order to find the answer to the question: What ought to be, what should be proclaimed tomorrow? . . . Its questioning of the past must be related to the life-and death questions with which the future confronts theology, even though many *quaestiones quodlibetales* of second- and third-rate medieval theologians remain unedited and undiscussed" (*Vatican II,* pp. 591-592); for the "Rockhurst Report," see Resolution 23, *op. cit.,* p. 341. Cf. also Michael Richards, "Church History in the Seminary," *The Clergy Review,* vol.LXII (May, 1967), pp. 364-375.

[27] Cf. "The Training of Scholastics Especially in Studies," point 21, *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation,* p. 31.

[28] Naturally, I cannot and will not limit my consideration to the three sides of the problem presented above. Whenever there is need to widen the scope of the enquiry, I will turn to other sources as well or use my own ideas and make appropriate recommendations. On this point three studies will be especially helpful: George Malone, "Theological Consensus: The Present Dilemma," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* vol. CLIV (April, 1966), pp. 242-256; John L. Murphy, "The Seminary College Course," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* vol. CLV (October, 1966), pp. 242-257; and Kevin Condon, "Seminary Reform: Educating in Theology," *Doctrine and Life,* vol. 17 (February, 1967), pp. 70-81.

[29] For some of the ideas proposed in this section of the paper I am greatly indebted to W. D. Wagoner's work already mentioned and a few of my colleagues and friends with whom I repeatedly discussed the problem.

[30] See the *NCWC news release* for May 5, 1967 of a conference given by Louis J. Putz, at Notre Dame, Indiana.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Timothy Healy, "The Emerging Role of Catholic Higher Education," *Fordham* (April-May, 1967), p. 14.

[33] Louis J. Putz, "New Approaches to Seminary Formation," *Ave Maria* (May 6, 1967), p. 16.

[34] *Ibid.,* p. 17.

[35] *Ibid.;* W. D. Wagoner (*op. cit.,* pp. 101-106) gives a dramatic illustration in relation to the British of what happened when the intellectual standard of the priest is greatly different from that of the layman. See also John L. Murphy, *loc. cit.*

[36] *Decree on Priestly Formation, Documents,* p. 444.

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] W. D. Wagoner, *op. cit.,* p. 85. Hilary Ottensmeyer writes on this point: "On these larger seminary campuses, then, we must set up authentic liberal arts colleges that deserve—and get—regional accreditation. Our colleges must no longer be desiccated, pre-theological preparatory schools good neither for the future work of theology nor for imparting the important disciplines of the undergraduate years . Evolutions in the concept of theological

studies make it urgent that the collegian be trained in the best liberal arts tradition" ("Blueprint for Seminaries," *America,* vol. 113 [December 18-25, 1965], p. 781).

[39] W. D. Wagoner, *op. cit.,* p. 89.

[40] *Ibid.,* pp. 79-81.

[41] *Decree,* 5; *Documents,* p. 443.

[42] The true nature of systematic theology is "to serve the living proclamation of the gospel and the Christian existence of today urged on by awareness of the problems of practical pastoral care," K. Rahner, "The Task of Theology after the Council," *Vatican II,* p. 591; cf. also Rahner, "The Prospects for Dogmatic Theology," *Theological Investigations,* vol. I, p. 1-18; the *Decree* itself clearly indicates this basic function of systematic theology by saying in reference to students: "Let them learn to search for solutions to human problems with the light of revelation, to apply eternal truths to the changing conditions of human affairs, and to communicate such truths in a manner suited to contemporary man," no. 16; *Documents* p. 452.

[43] No. 17; *ibid.,* p. 453.

[44] Avery Dulles, "Revelation and the Apostolate," *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary,* p. 113.

[45] Warren A. Quanbeck, "A Response," *Documents,* p. 459.

[46] Even the *Decree* refers to this problem indirectly by stating that "the unified and substantial quality of all this training should be carefully provided for; hence excessively multiplying of subjects and classes is to be avoided. Those questions should be omitted which retain scarcely any significance, or which should be left for higher academic studies" (no. 17; *Documents,* p. 453). In view of this text I can foresee some objections to my own curriculum idea presented on the following pages. One can see that the "repetitious" historical courses should be greatly reduced in number. I agree wholeheartedly, on one condition, i.e., if group-teaching is taken seriously and applied systematically. In such a case even one history course would seem sufficient: the professors of the history of the Church, of the development of dogma, of dogmatic and moral theology and of liturgy could do invaluable service to both theology and student by developing all the historical aspects together in one course. As an example in this regard, I should refer to Hilary Ottensmeyer's ideas put forth in his article, "Blueprint for Seminaries," *loc. cit.,* pp. 780-781. Particularly noteworthy is the following passage: "On the theological level, we need to consolidate the often repeated areas of study into blocks of subjects matter, leaving more time for seminar work and private study. We have made a start in this direction here in the school of theology. Three basic courses cover the material formerly spread out in separate classes. These courses are: Foundations of doctrinal theology, co-ordinating fundamental dogma and introduction to Scripture; moral principles, grouping moral theology and canon law; finally, historical foundations, combining Church history, patrology, history of worship (liturgy) and Christian archeology. A graduate program or 'major course' at this level would give the more talented theologians the challenge they require"

(p. 781). From my point of view, it is the third area that looks promising, especially for group-teaching.

[47] The bachelor's program should be a flexible one, set up according to local strengths, particular demands and needs. Experimentation, especially during the first few years of any new curriculum, requires a variety of approaches and methods.

[48] Cf., e.g., François Houtart, "Suggestions for Doctrinal Development," *Vatican II,* pp. 545-552.

[49] The study of the Latin language would also certainly prepare the student for later work in philosophy and theology.

[50] For a general view encompassing the whole curriculum, see Appendix II at the end of this study. Note also that courses in the doctrine of grace and sacramentology are missing from the schema: firstly, because the historical questions should be taken care of in the history of the development of dogma; and secondly, because even their systematic parts should never be treated as independent disciplines. They belong integrally to Christology, ecclesiology and Christian anthropology.

[51] Consisting of 9 required and 6 freely chosen credit hours.

[52] Consisting of 3 required and 3 freely chosen credit hours.

[53] We owe this in justice to those who either leave the seminary on their own or are forced to leave and find themselves—after having spent long years studying theology—without any degree whatsoever.

[54] Cf. e.g., the *Breviloquim,* the *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum, Commentarius in I Librum Sententiarum,* and *Collattiones in Hexaëmeron,* of St. Bonaventure. Cf. also the classic work in this regard: Titus Szabo, *De SS. Trinitate in Creaturis Refulgente Doctrina S. Bonaventurae* (Rome :Herder).

[55] Cf., e.g., Jean-Francois Bonnefoy, *Christ and the Cosmos* (Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1965); also his article, "La Place du Christ dans le plan divin de la création," *Mélanges de science religieuse,* vol. 4 (1947), pp. 257-284; vol. 5 (1948), pp. 39-62; see also Michael D. Mailach, *From Order to Omega* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1967).

[56] Cf. Leon Seiller, *L'activité humaine du Christ selon Duns Scot* (Paris: Éditions franciscaines, 1944); Oswald Holzer, "Sterblichkeit und Unverweslichkeit Christi nach der Lehre des seligen Johannes Duns Skotus," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit,* vol. 13 (1950), pp. 65-80.

[57] Cf., e.g., Jacques Heerinckx, "De Momento Caritatis in Spiritualitate Franciscana," *Antonianum,* vol. 13 (1938), pp. 19-32; 135-170; 475-488.

[58] *Progress and Religion* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1929), p. 171.

[59] Cf. J. M. Cameron, *Images of Authority* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 63, note 3.

[60] *Progress and Religion,* pp. 171-172.

[61] Cf. J. M. Cameron, *op. cit.,* pp. 62-64.

[62] *Ibid.,* p. 62.

[63] *Ibid.*

[64] *Ibid.,* p. 63.

[65] "The most important work today is to show the unity between theology and anthropology. They are also related. My friend Rabbi Abraham Heschel sums it up nicely when he says: 'The Bible is not a theology for man; it is an anthropology for God.' I believe that in fact it is both. I have quoted that sentence many times. It means that you cannot separate God and man. . . . Theologians like Rahner and Schillebeeckx might seem to be studying man more than God. But this is a false impression. They study God in the light of modern anthropology, and I agree completely with this approach. . . . For many people today atheism is not the negation of God; it is the affirmation of man" (Patrick Granfield, "Interview with Yves Congar," *America,* May 6, 1967, p. 677).

	INTRODUCTORY COURSE: OUTLINE OF THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST. "Meaning, Interrelationship, and Pastoral Intent of Ecclesiastical Studies."				
FIRST YEAR	**FIRST STAGE OF THE HISTORY OF SALVATION** THE OLD TESTAMENT Critical Introduction To the Bible To each Book Exegesis **BIBLICAL THEOLOGY°**	**HISTORY OF ANCIENT NEAR EAST** Historical Background of the Old Testament (Preferably in Junior College)	PRINCIPLES of LOGIC and EPISTEMOLOGY (Preferably in Junior College) **HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY** The PHILOSOPHY of the ANCIENT EAST AND GREECE (To Aristotle)	**°BIBLICAL THEOLOGY** OLD TESTAMENT THEMES	APOLOGETICS A Synthesis of the EXTERNAL & INTERNAL METHODS Reasoned Demonstration of Divine Origin & Credibility of Church Christianity's relevant and attractive answer to man's Quest and Destiny
SECOND YEAR	**SECOND STAGE OF THE HISTORY OF SALVATION** THE NEW TESTAMENT Realization of salvation by Christ Critical Study of New Testament Books Exegesis **BIBLICAL THEOLOGY°°**			**°°BIBLICAL THEOLOGY** NEW TESTAMENT THEMES	
THIRD YEAR		**FIRST PERIOD** (to 1054) PRIMITIVE & PASTORAL CHURCH The Church and the Greco-Roman World The CHURCH in the EARLY MIDDLE AGES The Church Christianizes the People who destroyed the Roman Empire	**HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY** HELLENISTIC PHILOSOPHY and CIVILIZATION (Stoicism, Neo-Platonism Hermetic Writings, Mystery Cults)	**THEOLOGY of the GREEK and LATIN FATHERS** (PATRISTIC THEOLOGY)	
FOURTH YEAR		**SECOND PERIOD** (to 1517) THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH The Church, Maker and Mistress of WESTERN CIVILIZATION (Triumphs, Failures, Decline)	**HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY** MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY Topical Treatises Epistemology, Ontology Cosmology, Psychology Ethics, Theodicy	**MEDIEVAL THEOLOGY** (MONASTIC and SCHOLASTIC) St. Anselm, St. Bernard St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, etc.	
FIFTH YEAR		**THIRD PERIOD** (to 1815) MODERN CHURCH to the FRENCH REVOLUTION The Tragedy of the Protestant Break The Counter Reformation Increasing Separation of the Modern World from Christianity	**HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY** RENAISSANCE HUMANISM RATIONALISM ENGLISH EMPHIRICISM The "ENLIGHTENMENT" The SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION PHILOSOPHY of SCIENCE	THEOLOGY of the REFORMATION and JANSENISM Rise of POSITIVE THEOLOGY	**DOGMATIC TOPICAL TREATISES** GOD ONE and TRIUNE CREATOR ELEVATION OF MAN TO SUPERNATURAL ORDER
SIXTH YEAR		**FOURTH PERIOD** (to —) MODERN CHURCH to the PRESENT DAY 19th Century Challenges— Vatican I Early 20th Century Modernism Contemporary Challenge of a Secularized World Vatican II The great work of RENEWAL	**HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY** 19th CENTURY PHILOSOPHY IDEALISM, POSIVITISM MATERIALISM 20th CENTURY PHILOSOPHY PHENOMENOLOGY EXISTENTIALISM ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE	19th CENTURY CATHOLIC and PROTESTANT THEOLOGY (Modernism) CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL INSIGHTS and CHALLENGES	**CHRISTOLOGY** MARIOLOGY - CHURCH GRACE (possibily with Moral Theology) SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY (possibly with Moral Theology) ESCHATOLOGY

	MORAL THEOLOGY CANON LAW	LITURGY	HOMILETICS (CATECHESIS)	PSYCHOLOGY RELIGIOUS ANTHROPOLOGY SOCIOLOGY	DIVERSE SUBJECTS
FIRST YEAR	FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES of MORALITY (''Natural'') The Psychological, Sociological, Existential Facticity of Human Condition		PRINCIPLES of PUBLIC SPEAKING (Preferably in Junior College) **THEOLOGY of PREACHING** HISTORY of PREACHING OLD TESTAMENT (PROPHETS)	PHENOMENOLOGY and PSYCHOLOGY of RELIGION Primitive Religious Main non-Christian Religions	LANGUAGES (LATIN, ETC.) (if needed, otherwise but taken care of in Junior College)
SECOND YEAR	NEW TESTAMENT MORALITY GRACE, LOVE, and SERVICE	FORMATIOI OF THE LITURGY O. T. TYPES N. T. LITURGY	HISTORY of PREACHING NEW TESTAMENT (PREACHING of JESUS) KERYGMA of PRIMITIVE CHURCH (Evangelists, St. Paul)		LANGUAGES (as above)
THIRD YEAR	LIFE of FELLOWSHIP with GOD (GRACE) The THEOLIGICAL VIRTUES CANON LAW I	FORMATION of the LITURGY PATRISTIC CHURCH MEDIEVAL CHURCH	HISTORY of PREACHING (FATHERS of the CHURCH)		
FOURTH YEAR	LIFE of FELLOWSHIP with GOD RELIGION SACRAMENTS CANON LAW II		HISTORY of PREACHING (The MEDIEVAL CHURCH)	PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY COUNSELING TECHNIQUES Pastoral and Marriage Counseling	
FIFTH YEAR	LOVE for our FELLOW HUMAN BEINGS JUSTICE CANON LAW III	LITURGICAL DIMENSIONS of the MYSTERY of SALVATION	HISTORY of PREACHING (The REFORMATION and POST-REFORMATION PERIOD)	PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY COUNSELING TECHNIQUES Pastoral and Marriage Counseling	NON-CATHOLIC (Orthodox and Protestant) CHURCHES (May best be treated with the general History of the Church)
SIXTH YEAR	LOVE for our FELLOW HUMAN BEINGS MARRIAGE	LITURGICAL DIMENSIONS of the MYSTERY of SALVATION (The EUCHARIST)	CONTEMPORARY ETHICAL PROBLEMS and CHALLENGES **PREACHING in the CONTEMPORARY WORLD** (''The Age of Advertising and of the Image'') Techniques of Relevant	SOCIOLOGY Modern and Contemporary Social Problems and Challenges (Marxism, Social Justice)	HISTORY OF THE CHURCH U.S.A. PROTESTANT CHURCHES U.S.A.

Novitiate				Revelation	Salvation History Primacy of Christ	Christian Symbolism Liturgy	The Contemporary Man		Latin (?)
1st Year	Logic Epistemology	Old Testament		Phenomenology of Religion	Problem of God				Biblical Languages Introduction to Research
2nd Year	History: Orient Greek Hellenistic	New Testament	Primitive and Patristic Church	New Testament and the Fathers	Christ and Redemption		New Testament and Fathers		
3rd Year	Medieval and Modern	Exegesis	Medieval and Reformation	Medieval and Post-Trent	The Church		Christianity Anthropology		
4th Year	19th and 20th Centuries		19th and 20th Centuries	19th and 20th Centuries	Eschatology Ecumenical Theology	Liturgical Dimensions of Mystery of Salvation			Contemporary Literature
5th and 6th Years	Contemporary systems Philosophy of science Individual philosophers Sociology Psychology Situation Ethics Marxism God in contemporary philosophy	Hermeneutics Contemporary Studies Biblical Theology The Covenant Etc.	Theology of the Dialogue	Theology of Vatican II Diaspora Church Theology of Latity Church in the Modern World	Mariology Scripture and Tradition Theology of Sin Primacy and Collegiality Theology of Death Theology of History	Liturgical Dimensions of Mystery of Salvation Liturgy and Sacramental Life	Theology of Marriage Counseling Life of Grace Theology of Penance	Theology of Preaching Teaching Methods Catechetics	Sociology of Religion Psychoanalysis World Religions

INDEX

Abortion, 100-101
Apologetics, 120
Apostolate, 56 ff.
Armstrong, Richard, 140 n. 2
Aubert, R., 142 n. 2
Auricchio, John, 113-122
Authority, 94-95, 98

Baccalaureate program, 133-134
Birth control, 98-99
Bonaventure, St., 145 n. 45
  university, 20
Bonnefoy, J.-F., 145 n. 55
Bourke, Myles, 75-76
Bouyer, Louis, 116
Boxing, 91-92
Brasenose Conference on automation of libraries, 23 n.
Brooks, Robert, 47
Burghardt, W. J., 141 n. 3
Burns, Norman, 66

Cameron, J. M., 145 n. 59
Canon Law Society of America and *imprimatur*, 17
Carter, Alexander, 140 n. 2
Catechetics, 121
Catholic laity, 9
Catholic Library Association, 21
Church, 8, 11, 35, 71, 74, 78, 87, 88, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 104, 107, 108, 110, 112, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 125, 129, 133, 134, 135, 137
Christ, 6, 9, 24, 46, 57, 63, 72, 82, 83, 89, 105, 114, 116, 118, 121, 138, 140
Circumstances, source of morality, 84-85
Civil degrees, 131
Community,
  schedule, 43-44
  spirit, 44-45
Condon, Kevin, 140 n. 3
Congar, Yves, 115
Conjugal obedience, 99-100
Cooperative effort, 132
Culture, 28-29
Cummings, Juniper, 36, 38
Curriculum,
  theology, 112 ff.

Danielou, J., 116
D'Arcy, Paul, 32, 47, 58
Dawson, Christopher, 138-139
Dayton, University of, 35
Decree on Appropriate Renewal of Religious Life, 72
Decree of Ministry and Life of Priests, 17, 72
Decree on Priestly Formation, 12, 13, 56-57, 72, 76, 102, 112, 127, 131, 132
Degrees, Academic, 131
Dialogue, 54-55
Discussion, theological, 101
Divorce, 100
Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, 74
Dulles, Avery, 144, n. 44

Epikeia, part of justice, 85-86
Erikson, Erik H., 48 ff., 57
Existentialism, 84
Experience, supervised, 58

Faith, 114
Falsiloquium, 90
Formation, apostolic, 102 ff.
Franciscan province of Sacred Heart, 20
Franciscan Subject Headings, 20
Franciscan Union Catalog, 20

Franciscan vision, 138-140
notion of secularity, 138-139
similar to modern secularism, 139-140
theological view of man and world, 138
Freedom human, 85
Friendship, 52-54

Gardini, W., 141 n. 3
Garrone, Cardinal, 73, 74, 75
God, 6, 9, 38, 39, 71, 76, 77, 82, 87, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 100, 103, 105, 115, 116, 120, 135
Godin, André, 60 n.
Graduate program, 136
Granfield, Patrick, 146 n. 65
Grassi, Joseph A., 80 n. Greeley, Andrew, 47
Gustafson, James M., 140 n. 3

Healy, Timothy, 143 n. 32
Heerinckx, J. 145 n. 57
Heschel, Abraham, 146 n. 65
Historical approach, 136-137
History of Church, 119
History of Dogma, 119
Holy Spirit, 6, 96
Honesty, 88-89
Houtart, F., 145 n. 48
Howe, Reuel L., 55
Hurley, Denis, 12

Identity formation, 48
Imprimatur, 17
Inbreeding, elimination of, 131
Index of forbidden books, 17
In-service training, 32-33
Intimacy, 48-49, 52
Isolation, 48-49

Jansenism, 129-130
Justice, 89

Kaam, van, Adrian, 50
Keller, James, 140 n. 2
Kelly, Justin S., 141 n. 5
Kennedy, Eugene, 32, 47, 58
Kennedy, John F., 11
Koenig, Harry C., 23 n.
Kortendick, James, 11, 13, 21

La Fleur, Angelus, 38
Lang, Jovian, 18, 22 n.
Law of Christianity, primary, 86
Lawler, Ronald D., 79 n.
Laws, 94-95
Laymen, 27
Leahy, William K., 141 n. 3
Le Bont, Walter, 48
Lee, James M., 21, 47
Legal Justice, 93
Library, 11-13
collections, 15-16
control, 14
Franciscan, 18-20
objectives, 13-14
seminary, 11 ff.
Licklider, J. C., 23 n.
Lie, 90-91
Liturgy, source of theology, 116

Mailach, Michael D., 145 n. 55
Mayly, Eugene, 77
Man, social being, 87
Manichaean world, 6
Massimini, Anthony T., 141 n. 3
Mersch, E. 113
Micro-film center, Catholic, 18
Midwest Association of Theological Schools, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69
Miller, J. H., 141 n. 6
Minor seminary, 1 ff.
advantages, 2-3
disadvantages, 3-4
Murphy, John L., 81 n.

McCoy Alan, 18
MacKenzie, R. A. F., 80 n.
McNamara, Robert J., 42

National Catholic Educational Association, 62
Natural law, 82-84
Nelson, Claud D., 141 n. 3
Niebuhr, H. Richard, 140 n. 3

Noonan, John T., 98-99, 101 n.
North Central Association, 61, 62, 63, 66
Notre Dame University, 11

Obedience, 96-97
Openness, human, 85
Ottensmeyer, Hilary, 143 n. 38

Passionist province of Holy Cross, 20
Pastoral and ecumenical dimensions in seminary, 31-32
Peer relationships, 51-56
Penal laws, 91
Personal encounter, students and faculty, 30
Personalist morality, 86-87
Phenomenology of religion, 121
Philosophy, 119
  courses, 40
Poole, Stafford, 140 n. 3
Pospishil, Victor J., 101 n.
Priest, cultic, 103-104
  pastoral, 104 ff.
Professional training, North American, 4-5
Psychology, 121

Quanbeck, Warren, A., 13, 127

Rahner, Karl, 75, 77, 106
  recommendations for theology curriculum, 124-126
Reinert, Paul, 32
Richards, M., 143 n. 26
Riley, Arthur, 16
Rockhurst College, 122
Rockhurst Report, 122-123
  four-year theology program, 122-123
  pre-theologate theology, 123

Schillebeeckx, Edward, 75
Scripture, Sacred, 71-81
  application and practice, 76-79
  principles and theory, 71-76
  place of, in seminary, 73-76
Seiller, Leon, 145 n. 56
Self-concept, 49
Self-identity, 52
Seminarians, at university, 42-43
  relationships with faculty, 55-56
Seminaries,
  minor, 1-10
  regional, 130-131
  rules of, 30-31
  standards for, 66-68
Servile work, 93
Servites, 20
Sin, 85, 89-90
Stuber, S. I., 141 n. 3
Szabo, Titus, 145 n. 54

Taxes, 93-94
Teaching, 131-133
  change in method, 131-132
  group-teaching, 133
Ten Commandments, 87
Textbooks, 122
Theology,
  Christocentric, 117
  ecclesiological themes in, 124-125
  fundamental, 120
  historical method in, 118, 127
  kerygmatic approach in, 126-127
  modern, its qualities, 115-116
  moral, 115, 120-121
  new approach, 125-126
  pastoral, 106 ff.
  special dogmatic, 120
  study of literature in, 127-128
  systematic, 137
Tolerance, 87-88
Trezza, Alphonse F., 23 n.
Tyrrell, Francis, 127-128

Vatican II, 1, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, 47, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75 102
Vocation, 6-7
  intellectual capacity as condition of, 130
Vorgrimler, Herbert, 80 n.

Wagoner, Walter, D., 64, 143 n. 45
Williams, Daniel D., 140 n. 3

-

PD-30662
5-17

DATE DUE

MAY 1 2 2008	
MAR 8 2013	